DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 015 PS 009 657

AUTHOR Anderson, Linda M.; And Others
TITLE Relationships Between Teacher and Observer Adjective Descriptions and Teacher Perceptions of Student Characteristics. Report No. 75-24.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [75]
CONTRACT NIE-C-74-0089; OEC-6-10-108
NOTE 121p.; Tables may be marginally legible due to print size

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; Elementary School Teachers; Expectation; *Measurement Techniques; Personality; *Rating Scales; Research; *Student Characteristics; *Teacher Attitudes; *Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Halo Effect

ABSTRACT

This study compares teacher and observer adjective descriptions of student characteristics to teacher rankings of the same students' characteristics on a series of 13 rating scales. Data reported were collected as part of the Student Attribute Study, a 2-year investigation designed to identify student characteristics which are associated with certain teacher attitudes and expectations. Student subjects were children in grades 2 through 5 who had received consistent teacher rankings over a 2-year period on scales describing such characteristics as self control, happiness, achievement, maturity, and creativity. At the end of the second year, in a free-response situation, teachers and observers provided short adjective descriptions of the most salient characteristics of each child. An analysis of adjective descriptions given for children who were ranked at the high, middle, and low positions for each scale showed that the scales had high face validity and that teachers had probably been considering appropriate characteristics when ranking students on each scale. However, certain adjectives (especially those describing intelligence) were significantly related to several scales, suggesting that they might comprise a cluster of attributes which produced a "halo effect." Approximately 60 pages of data are included. (Author/JMB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147015

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: PS TM

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER AND OBSERVER ADJECTIVE DESCRIPTIONS AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Linda M. Anderson,

Jere E. Brophy,

Carolyn M. Evertson,

Michael C. Baum,

and

John Crawford

Report No. 75-24

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

PS 009657

This project was supported by the National Institute of Education Contract OEC 6-10-108, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, and by Contract NIE-C-74-0089, Correlates of Effective Teaching. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred.

Abstract

This paper reports one set of data from the Student Attribute Study, a two-year investigation designed to identify student characteristics which are associated with certain teacher attitudes and expectations. Children in grades two through five were identified as receiving consistent teacher rankings over a two-year period on one or more of 13 scales describing student characteristics. At the end of the second year, in a free-response situation, teachers and classroom observers provided short adjective descriptions of the most salient characteristics of each child. An analysis of the adjective descriptions given for children who were ranked at the high, middle, and low positions for each scale showed that the scales had high face validity and that teachers had probably been considering appropriate characteristics when ranking their students on each scale. However, certain adjectives (especially those describing intelligence) were significantly related to several scales, suggesting that they might comprise a cluster of attributes which produces a "halo effect," so that students may have been ranked at a certain position on some scales because of an overall impression based on other characteristics than those defined by the scale.

This paper is one in a series of reports from the Student Attribute Study, a two-year investigation designed to identify student characteristics which are associated with certain teacher attitudes and expectations. Although much previous research (Brophy and Good, 1974) has demonstrated the existence of differential teacher expectations and their effects on teacher-student interaction, little is known about what student attributes lead to the formation of teacher attitudes and expectations. In this study, students who were identified as objects of consistent teacher attitudes or expectations were observed in their classrooms to learn what common characteristics were shared by students who were perceived by their teachers in similar ways.

Teachers' attitudes and expectations were measured by 13 scales identifying the following continua of behaviors or attributes:

1. Calm, good self control versus restless, highly active.
2. Careful, deliberate worker versus careless, hasty worker.
3. Happy versus unhappy.
4. Probable highest achiever versus probable lowest achiever.
5. Mature versus immature.
6. Cooperative, compliant versus uncooperative, defiant.
7. Creative, imaginative versus not creative or imaginative.
8. Attractive versus unattractive.
9. Tries hard, persistent worker versus gives up easily, needs to be prodded.

10. Would like to keep for another year for the sheer joy of it (attachment) versus would like to have removed from my class (rejection).
11. Concerns me a great deal; I would like to be able to devote much more attention to (concern) versus doesn't require special attention (low concern).
12. Stands out, very noticeable (salient) versus not noticeable (non-salient).
13. Looks you in the eye versus averts eyes.

Teachers were asked to rank the children in their class on each scale. The wording of the scales was as shown above, except that the terms in parentheses were not included. These brief terms are used when discussing the scales in the text, for economy of communication.

During the first year of the study, teachers in grades one through four in four elementary schools completed the scales at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year. The following year, teachers in grades two through five also completed the scales at the middle and end of the year, ranking the same children. In this way, children who were ranked in the first year of the study and who stayed in the same school were ranked again by a different teacher in the second year.

During the second half of the second year, the children who had been ranked by their teachers were observed in their classrooms by trained observers who coded their interactions with the teachers, using a low-inference coding system (Brophy, King, Evertson, Baum, Crawford, Mahaffey, and Sherman Note 1) developed specifically for this study. Each child was seen by two

observers (five times each) over a six-week period, with observers working independently once reliability on the coding system was established. Thus, a total of 10 half-day observations (about 20 hours) were made in each classroom. The observers knew that the children had been ranked on the 13 scales, but did not know how any particular child had been ranked on any scale.

In addition to the low-inference coding, high-inference data were collected at the end of the study. The coders used the same 13 scales as the teachers to rate the children they observed, and they scored each child on a 44-item behavioral checklist. Also, both coders and teachers gave free-response descriptions of each child by naming three adjectives which characterized the child most centrally (in their opinion), and they noted any unusual situations such as illness or home problems.

When the fifth teacher ranking was completed at the end of the second year, it was used with the other four teacher rankings to identify 362 children who were ranked consistently on one or more scales <u>across the two year period</u>. Children were considered "consistent" if they were ranked within the high, middle, or low thirds of the teacher rankings on <u>each</u> of the five rankings. These "high," "middle," and "low" designations for children who were ranked consistently constituted the criteria for the study. All other data were compared to them in determining what attributes were associated with particular scales.

This report focuses on the teachers' and coders' adjective descriptions and their relationships to the criterion rankings. Other data are discussed in other reports in this series (Anderson, Brophy, Evertson, Crawford, and

Baum, Note 2; Baum, Brophy, Evertson, Crawford, and Anderson, Note 3; Coulter, Brophy, Evertson, Crawford, Baum, and Anderson, Note 4; Baum, Brophy, Evertson, Anderson, and Crawford, Note 5; and Evertson, Brophy, Anderson, Crawford, and Baum, Note 6).

Since the adjective descriptions were collected in a limited free-response situation, only the characteristics of each child which were most salient to the respondent were mentioned and scored. The rankings, on the other hand, forced the teachers to place every child somewhere on every continuum. Because of this difference, two types of information are provided by an analysis of the categories of adjectives which are associated with each scale: 1) The most salient characteristics of children ranked consistently on each scale are identified. This information is important, not only because it further validates the scales, but also because it defines clusters of characteristics which collectively determine the teachers' impressions of children ranked consistently on a particular dimension. 2) Further information is gained by identifying groups of adjectives which are associated with <u>several</u> scales. These adjectives can be assumed to define characteristics which are generally more salient than others and which may contribute to "halo effects" observed in the data (most scales were strongly intercorrelated).

Of course, objective considerations may lead to correlated scales, such as for the scales "probable highest achiever vs. probable lowest achiever" and "careful, deliberate worker vs. careless, hasty worker." However, high correlations for scales such as the achievement scale and "attractive vs. unattractive" scale, where no underlying rationale exists, strongly suggest halo effects in the teacher rankings.

Method

The adjective descriptions were collected by asking each teacher and coder to name the three most salient characteristics of each child in adjective form. Any pertinent additional information also was solicited, such as home or medical conditions which could have affected the child's behavior in the classroom. Each child was described by one teacher, except at one school where two teachers responded. Two coders described each child. When any discrepancy occurred between adult opinions about a child, the discrepant adjectives were omitted from the data. (This was rare, occurring in less than one per cent of the responses.) Otherwise, all of the adjectives given for a child by the two coders and by the teacher were considered in scoring, although the two data subsets (teachers and coders) were considered separately.

A coding system was developed to score the adjectives so that synonymous descriptions would be equivalent. A list of variables was constructed to include each category of adjectives occurring with sufficient frequency to allow statistical analyses. There were 27 variables representing categories used by both coders and teachers. In addition to these, there were three categories of adjectives used with sufficient frequency by the coders to be scored for them, but not for the teachers. Likewise, there were nine categories of adjectives used by the teachers but not the coders. There was also a proportion computed for each child reflecting the number of positive adjectives given out of the total of positive and negative adjectives given by the coders or teacher, respectively. A description of the scoring categories used appears in the appendix.

The teachers' and coders' adjectives for each child were scored by two independent raters, with differences then resolved by discussion. Scoring involved placing each adjective into one of the categories, such as "likable," "mature," "responsible," etc. Adjectives which did not fit into any categories but which clearly implied a negative or positive evaluation were considered as "residual negative" or "residual positive." Those adjectives which could not be categorized and which were not clearly positive or negative were not scored at all. (For example, "animal lover" and "low key person" were not scored.)

There were two types of variables, each with different scoring procedures. Some variables were bipolar and were scored as either low, high, or no data (or as low, middle, high, or no data, for two variables). Other variables were unipolar (presence/absence) for a particular characteristic. This distinction is important, because of the number of children scored for each variable is affected, and the interpretation of results is different for the two types of variables.

For example, consider a bipolar variable such as "social interaction." Possible scores on the variable were 1 for the category "shy" and 2 for the category "outgoing." Children scored for this variable were those who were described either as "shy" or "outgoing" (or with synonymous adjectives). Children who were not described as either of these were not scored for that variable. Therefore, bipolar variables were not scored for all children, but only for those who were described as representing one of the extremes.

On the other hand, present/absent variables were scored for every child. If the characteristic in question was mentioned, the child was given a score

of 1 for present. If the characteristic was not mentioned, a 0 for absent was scored. Examples of such variables were "aggressive," "inattentive," and "absent a great deal." These categories were not scored as bipolar because the other end of the continuum of the characteristic was not mentioned as salient enough times to be scored. (That is, adjectives such as "non-aggressive," "attentive," and "always attends school" were rarely or never used.) However, some dimensions of behavior were noticeable for both extremes (such as social interaction and attractiveness), so that both were seen as salient characteristics and thus were mentioned often enough to be scored.

Analysis

One-way analyses of variance were performed, using the high, middle, and low positions for each of the 13 scales as classifying variables in analyzing the variance of each adjective variable for teachers and for coders.

These analyses indicate, for each scale, the characteristics which were most salient for children who were ranked consistently on that scale. In interpreting the results, the distinction between bipolar and unipolar variables must be kept in mind. A significant result for a bipolar adjective variable indicates that children at an extreme on a certain teacher ranking scale were more likely to be described in a particular way, rather than the opposite (e.g., shy rather than outgoing). However, a significant result for a unipolar adjective variable means that a child at an extreme on that teacher ranking scale was more likely to be described by that adjective

category than not. In the first case, only children at the extremes of the continuum described by the adjective were included, because only the extremes were scored. In the second case, all children were scored and can be considered in interpretation. Of course, the greater frequency of children scored for adjective categories which were unipolar means that the chances of obtaining significant F values were increased for these variables. Refer to Table I for scoring conventions and N's for each variable.

Results

Significant results ($p \leq .05$) for each scale are presented below. Agreements and disagreements between teachers and coders also are noted as each scale is discussed.

The underlined descriptions refer to the extremes of the teacher ranking scales. In all cases, the first adjective in the scale title represents the high end of the continuum. For example, children described as calm were the ones ranked high on the "calm vs. restless" scale, while children described as restless were ranked low on the same scale.

In presenting the results this way, we will be using the teacher rankings as if they were objective, factual data, which they are not. This is done to facilitate communication of the results. Readers should bear in mind that underlined adjectives refer to children consistently ranked high or low on one of the 13 scales by two teachers. Thus, these adjectives reflect teacher perceptions, not objective assessments. The nature of the data from the study as a whole suggests that most of these perceptions are accurate,

but the possibility of consistent but nevertheless false impressions cannot be ruled out. Thus, calm technically means "consistently perceived as calm, compared to classmates," and so on. Therefore, statements such as "teachers and coders saw calm children as being quiet . . ." mean that both groups were more likely to use the adjective variable "quiet" to describe children consistently perceived as calm than they were to use this adjective in describing children ranked at the low or middle positions of the scale. The numbers in parentheses following each adjective refer to the variable numbers in Table 1.

Calm, Good Self Control vs. Restless, Highly Active

Both teachers and coders saw calm children as being quiet (4), cooperative (5), well behaved (6), intelligent (9), high achievers (10), and having good work habits (11). Both groups also saw the middle and high children on this scale as having good peer relations (12), and both gave higher percentages of positive adjectives (40) to children ranked higher on this scale. Both groups also agreed that restless children were aggressive (13), active (15), and low in frustration tolerance (18).

Teachers, but not coders, saw calm children as being responsible (14), self-motivated (8), and "sweet" (32). Teachers also saw restless children as being teacher dependent (27), as underachievers (33), and as exhibiting immoral behavior (35). Teachers saw children ranked low and middle on this scale as having higher positive affect (3).

Coders, but not teachers, saw calm children as being more mature (2), and having better teacher relations (37), and they gave more unclassifiable

positive descriptions (23) for these children. The coders saw restless children as being more socially interactive (1).

Careful, Deliberate Worker vs. Careless, Hasty Worker

Both teachers and coders saw careful children as having high intelligence (9), high achievement (10), and good work habits (11). Both groups also agreed that careless children were more active (15). Both also gave higher percentages of positive statements (40) to children ranked higher on this scale.

The teachers also described careful children as being responsible (14), mature (2), quiet (4), cooperative (5), self-motivated (8) considerate (16), and as having good homes (28). The teachers described careless children as being inattentive (17), underachieving (33), and exhibiting immoral behavior (35).

The coders, but not the teachers, described careful children as well-behaved (6), as having good teacher relations (37), and with unclassifiable positive adjectives (23). They saw careless children as being aggressive (13), and having low frustration tolerance (18).

Happy vs. Unhappy

Both groups agreed that happy children had high intelligence (9) and good work habits (11), and both gave higher percentages of positive descriptions (40) to children ranked higher on this scale.

Teachers described happy children as being social leaders (24), responsible (14), cooperative (5), self-motivated (8), and coming from good homes (28). Teachers described unhappy children as being absent a great deal of the time (31) and having low frustration tolerance (18).

Coders described children ranked high and in the middle on this scale as having good peer relations (12) and also said that happy children had good teacher relations (37).

Probable Highest Achiever vs. Probable Lowest Achiever

Teachers and coders agreed that high achieving children were self-motivated (8), had high intelligence (9), and were high achievers (10). They also gave higher percentages of positive statements (40) to children ranked high on this scale.

Teachers also described high achieving children as responsible (14), mature (2), creative (29), athletic (20), and has having good homes (28). Teachers described low achieving children as inattentive (17), as absent a great deal (31), and as exhibiting immoral behavior (35).

Coders described high achieving children with more residual negative adjectives (22) but also with more residual positive adjectives (23), and they attributed good teacher relations (37) and good work habits (11) to them. Thus, high achievers were very salient to coders, but they were not perceived in a uniformly positive way (in contrast with the teachers' perceptions).

Mature vs. Immature

Teachers and coders both described mature children as mature (2), as intelligent (9), and as having high achievement (10), and good work habits (11). They also gave a higher frequency of positive adjectives (40) to children ranked higher on this scale, and described immature children as active (15).

Teachers also described mature children as responsible (14), quiet (4), cooperative (5), self-motivated (8), creative (29), and as having good homes (28). Teachers described immature children as having low frustration tolerance (18) and high frequencies of medical problems (30). Teachers described children in the low and middle positions on this scale as being teacher dependent (27).

Coders described mature children as being well-behaved (6), and gave more unclassifiable positive adjectives (23) for mature children. They gave more unclassifiable negative adjectives (22) for those children in the middle position on this scale (but not the children seen as immature).

Cooperative, Compliant vs. Uncooperative, Defiant

Both groups agreed that cooperative children were quiet (4), cooperative (5), intelligent (9), and had good work habits (11). They also gave more positive adjectives (40) to children ranked higher on this scale and saw uncooperative children as active (15).

Teachers described cooperative children as being responsible (14), self-motivated (8), high achieving (10), coming from good homes (28), having good peer relations (12), and being "sweet" (32). Teachers described

uncooperative children as being aggressive (13), inattentive (17), having medical problems (30), being underachievers (33), and having low frustration tolerance (18), and they used more unclassifiable negative adjectives (22) to describe children in the middle of this continuum.

Coders, but not teachers, described cooperative children as being well-behaved (6), and they gave more unclassifiable positive adjectives (23) for cooperative children.

Creative, Imaginative vs. Not Creative or Imaginative

Both groups agreed that creative children had high intelligence (9). They also agreed in giving a higher percentage of positive adjectives (40) to children ranked higher on this scale.

Teachers also described creative children as being social leaders (24), high achievers (10), creative (29), and athletic (20). Teachers more often gave unclassifiable negative adjectives (22) for uncreative children, while coders more often gave unclassifiable negative adjectives (22) for creative children.

Attractive vs. Unattractive

Both groups agreed in describing attractive children as attractive (26) and intelligent (9). They both gave higher percentages of positive adjectives (40) for children ranked higher on this scale. They also agreed that unattractive children were inattentive (17).

Teachers also described attractive children as having more positive affect (3), being higher achievers (10), and being athletic (20). Teachers

described unattractive children as aggressive (13), having more unclassifiable negative adjectives (22), having more medical problems (30), and being absent a great deal (31).

Coders, but not teachers, described attractive children as having good work habits (11).

Tries Hard, Persistent Worker vs. Gives Up Easily, Needs to be Prodded

Coders and teachers described persistent children as self-motivated (8), intelligent (9), high achieving (10), and having good work habits (11). They both gave higher percentages of positive adjectives (40) to children ranked higher on this scale.

Teachers also described persistent children as being responsible (14), mature (2), cooperative (5), and having good homes (28). The teachers saw children who gave up easily as being active (15), absent a great deal (31), and inattentive (17).

The coders saw persistent children as being well-behaved (6), with good teacher relations (37), and they gave more unclassifiable negative adjectives (22) to these children. The coders described children in the middle and high positions on this scale as being less salient (19) but as having good peer relations (12). The coders described children who gave up easily as having low frustration tolerance (18).

Would Like to Keep for Another Year for the Sheer Joy of It (Attachment) vs. Would Like to Have Removed from My Class (Rejection)

Teachers and coders both described attachment children as being cooperative (5), well-behaved (6), intelligent (9), and having good work habits (11).

They each also gave higher percentages of positive statements to children ranked higher on this scale. The two groups also agreed in describing rejection children as being active (15).

Teachers, but not coders, described attachment children as being responsible (14), while coders saw the middle group in this scale as being responsible (14). Teachers also saw attachment children as being quiet (4), as self-motivated (8), as high achievers (10), and as having a good home (28). Teachers described rejection children as being inattentive (17), as under-achievers (33), and as exhibiting immoral behavior (35).

Concerns Me a Great Deal; I Would Like to be Able to Devote Much More Attention to (Concern) vs. Doesn't Require Special Attention (Low Concern)

Both teachers and coders described concern children as active (15). They both described low concern children as being self-motivated (8), intelligent (9), high achievers (10), and having good work habits (11). Both groups gave higher percentages of positive adjectives (40) to children ranked low on this scale; that is, they perceived children who were objects of low concern more positively.

Teachers saw concern children as being inattentive (17), having low frustration tolerance (18), and having medical problems (30), and they described low concern children as coming from good homes (28).

Coders, but not teachers, described low concern children as attractive (26) but also as bossy (39).

Stands Out, Very Noticeable (Salient) vs. Not Noticeable (Non-Salient)

Teachers and coders both saw salient children as being socially interactive (1), active (15), intelligent (9), and having positive affect (3). They also agreed that non-salient children were quiet (4). They both gave higher percentages of positive adjectives (40) to salient children.

Teachers also described salient children as social leaders (24), aggressive (13), high achievers (10), creative (29), and having a sense of humor (21), and they gave more unclassifiable positive adjectives (23) for this group. Teachers, but not coders, gave higher percentages of positive adjectives (40) to children ranked higher on this scale. Teachers described non-salient children as being absent (31) more often.

Coders described salient children as being confident (7) and bossy (39), and they also gave more unclassifiable negative adjectives (22) for this group. Coders described non-salient children as being well-behaved (6), considerate (16), and non-salient (19).

Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes

Teachers and coders agreed that children who look you in the eye were intelligent (9). Both groups also gave higher percentages of positive adjectives (40) to children ranked higher on this scale.

Teachers described children who look you in the eye as being social leaders (24), as creative (29), and as having good homes (28). Teachers described children who avert eyes as being active (15), inattentive (17), absent (31), and exhibiting immoral behavior (35).

Coders described children who look you in the eye as being socially interactive (1), and they gave more unclassifiable negative adjectives (22)

for these children. The coders saw children ranked in the middle and high positions on this scale as having good work habits (!!).

Discussion

The adjectives which related to particular scales generally were ones which might have been expected from a common sense perspective. Therefore, since the salient characteristics of children who were ranked consistently on a given scale are reasonable, the use of the scales to identify children with certain attributes is generally supported and has face validity.

For seven scales, an adjective category existed which was synonymous with the scale, and the adjective was mentioned significantly often by both teachers and coders for children ranked on the scale. These scales and adjectives were "calm, good self-control vs. restless, highly active" (active), "careful, deliberate worker vs. careless, hasty worker" (good work habits), "probable highest achiever vs. probable lowest achiever" (high and low achievement), "mature vs. immature" (mature), "cooperative, compliant vs. uncooperative, defiant" (cooperative), "attractive vs. unattractive" (attractive), and "tries hard, persistent worker vs. gives up easily, needs to be prodded" (self-motivated). However, three scales did not show this association for one or both groups when synonymous adjectives were scorable: "happy vs. unhappy," "stands out, very noticeable vs. not noticeable," and "creative vs. not creative."

When teachers described children ranked consistently on the "happy vs. unhappy" scale, they used adjectives related to school performance: responsible, cooperative, good work habits, etc. They usually did not describe children ranked consistently on this scale with adjectives falling into the category of "positive vs. negative affect." In other words, children consistently ranked as high, medium, or low on the "happy vs. unhappy" scale were about equally likely to be described as happy or unhappy in the free-response situation. Likewise, coders did not use adjectives describing affect for children ranked at corresponding points on the scale, but were likely to use intelligence, good work habits, and good peer relations as descriptors of happy children.

Since the "happy vs. unhappy" scale does not show the face validity exhibited by other scales, and since adjectives describing affect were significant for only three of the scales, it can be concluded that happpiness is not as important as the other attributes in the formation of teacher attitudes and impressions. It remains to be seen, then, what impressions guided the teachers in ranking the children on the "happy vs. unhappy" scale. As will be discussed, there probably is a halo effect in operation for certain scales, causing rankings to be based on characteristics other than the one named in the scale.

For the "stands out, very noticeable vs. not noticeable" scale, one might expect children at the low end to be described with adjectives falling into the category "non-salient, average," This was true of coders, but not of teachers. Perhaps this can be attributed to the fact that teachers had much more contact with the children than the coders did, and therefore

could describe any child with three meaningful adjectives, even if that child did not particularly stand out in the classroom. However, they realized which children did not make themselves noticeable, and they ranked them accordingly.

The coders, who had to rely on memories of the children over a shorter period of time, perhaps could think of no meaningful adjectives to describe these children and thus resorted to the "non-salient, average" description. Teachers did not nominate non-salience as a "salient" characteristic, because they knew these students well enough to say something about them. In this case, therefore, the lack of concordance between the rankings and the synonymous adjective for the teachers does not necessarily imply lack of validity of the scale, especially since the coders apparently were reacting to the attribute of salience.

For the "creative vs. uncreative" scale, the adjective category "creative" was used significantly often by teachers to describe the students ranked at the high end of the scale, but this adjective was not used often enough by coders to even constitute a scorable category for them. This does not invalidate the scale, since the teachers' descriptions were consistent with their own rankings, but it does indicate that "creativity" was not a salient variable for the classroom observer. This might be due to differences in the coder's and teacher's roles in the classroom. Perhaps teachers recognized the attribute more readily because they had more opportunity to observe it. In particular, teachers had access to students' written work, probably the best source of information about student creativity.

The three scales which could not be directly compared to any specific adjective variables were "looks you in the eye vs. averts eyes," "would like to keep for another year for the sheer joy of it (attachment) vs. would like to have removed from my class (rejection)," and "concerns me a great deal; I would like to be able to devote much more attention to (concern) vs. doesn't require special attention (low concern).

It is not surprising that there were not synonymous adjectives for "looks you in the eye," since this usually is not considered a salient characteristic. Adjectives such as "withdrawn" or "direct" would be more likely. However, no such adjectives which might logically be related to the scale were offered, at least not with enough frequency to create a variable category.

One might consider the adjective category of "likable vs. obnoxious" as almost synonymous with the "attachment vs. rejection" scale. However, no scales, including "attachment vs. rejection" were associated with the "likable" variable, by either coders or teachers. This indicates that the attitude measured by the scale is more complex than a simple assessment of likability.

Another adjective variable which also might have been expected to be associated with attachment is "good vs. poor teacher relations" (scored only for coders). However, this variable also was not related to the scale. This indicates that the teacher attachment to particular students was not obvious to the classroom observers, even though teacher relations in general were. This confirms earlier findings suggesting that teachers do not usually show overt favoritism towards children they like best (Brophy & Good, 1974).

There were no adjective categories directly comparable to the teacher "concern vs. low concern" scale.

Since the attachment and concern attitudes are not easily predicted by student attributes but nonetheless are pervasive and potentially powerful influences on teacher-student interactions (Silberman, 1969; Good & Brophy, 1972), they were included in this study as criterion scales in order to examine what student attributes might determine them. An examination of the adjective descriptions reveals that attachment children do appropriate things in the classroom with regard to behavior and work, according to the teachers (rejection children were therefore described in opposite ways). The coders generally agreed, but they did not mention as many adjectives that were significantly associated with the scale, and they did not include such characteristics as quiet, self-motivated, and high achievement. This difference probably can be attributed to the different roles of coders and teachers. The coders viewed the attachment children with the same positive attitudes as the teachers, and they recognized many of the same characteristics, but they apparently were not as concerned with task-appropriate behavior as the teachers were.

Often, the same adjectives were associated with both of these scales, though in opposite directions due to the wording of the scales. This leads to questions about the relationships between the two scales. Since these two attitudes are not necessarily exclusive, one matter of special interest in the study was to identify characteristics which differentiated rejection children from concern children when the two attitudes did not overlap. The adjective variables which were associated with only one of these scales indicate such distinctions.

There were some teacher-coder differences in the data. One was the larger number of teacher adjectives associated with each scale. This was not surprising, since the teachers had established the criteria by their impressions, and one would expect their adjective descriptions to correspond to their rankings if the scales were valid indices of their attitudes. The inclusion of the coders' descriptions supplements the overall pictures of children ranked on each scale, and further validates the scales by showing that salient characteristics considered by the teachers in completing the scales generally were apparent to an objective observer.

The differences that did exist appeared to be due to the teachers having a more complete picture of each child as well as having different roles. (For an extended discussion of teacher and coder differences in adjective descriptions, see Baum, et al., Note 5).

The only direct contradiction between teacher and coder descriptions was that coders described creative children with unclassifiable negative adjectives, while teachers described uncreative children in this way. Since this adjective category is not clearly defined, the difference is difficult to interpret. Since the teachers gave the adjective description "creative" to children ranked high on the "creative vs. uncreative" scale and coders did not, it might be that the two groups have different perceptions of the characteristics subsumed by the label creative. Getzels and Jackson (1962) reported that teachers preferred conforming students to creative ones. The present data support this assertion: children nominated as "creative" generally were also seen as conforming by the teachers, while this relation-

ship was not as strong for the coders. Thus, the creativity ratings of the teachers are suspect, both because of halo effects and because of disagreement with the coders.

There were some surprising findings for adjectives associated with scales that would not be predicted by common sense but which are reasonable in retrospect. For example, careless children were seen by the coders as aggressive and as having low frustration tolerance. These adjectives imply a lack of calm, careful reflection, which makes sense for children ranked as careless. Unhappy children were described by the teachers as being absent a great deal. As discussed earlier, since the ranking of happy seemed to be more related to work behaviors and achievement than affect, this is not surprising.

High achieving, creative, and attractive children were described by teachers as being athletic. None of these results were expected. Perhaps the only children for whom athletic skills were salient to the teachers were those doing well in other areas. Children ranked high on the "attractive vs. unattractive" scale were described as having high intelligence by teachers and coders, high achievement (teachers only) and good work habits (coders only). Children ranked low in this scale were described as being inattentive (teachers and coders), aggressive (teachers), and absent a great deal (teachers). Since there is no obvious connection between attractiveness and school performance, there seems to be a halo effect operating here. However, remember that the adjective category of "attractive" also was used to describe students ranked high on the scale, so that there is some face validity to the scale. This is but one example of the general rule

ship was not as strong for the coders. Thus, the creativity ratings of the teachers are suspect, both because of halo effects and because of disagreement with the coders.

There were some surprising findings for adjectives associated with scales that would not be predicted by common sense but which are reasonable in retrospect. For example, careless children were seen by the coders as aggressive and as having low frustration tolerance. These adjectives imply a lack of calm, careful reflection, which makes sense for children ranked as careless. Unhappy children were described by the teachers as being absent a great deal. As discussed earlier, since the ranking of happy seemed to be more related to work behaviors and achievement than affect, this is not surprising.

High achieving, creative, and attractive children were described by teachers as being athletic. None of these results were expected. Perhaps the only children for whom athletic skills were salient to the teachers were those doing well in other areas. Children ranked high on the "attractive vs. unattractive" scale were described as having high intelligence by teachers and coders, high achievement (teachers only) and good work habits (coders only). Children ranked low in this scale were described as being inattentive (teachers and coders), aggressive (teachers), and absent a great deal (teachers). Since there is no obvious connection between attractiveness and school performance, there seems to be a halo effect operating here. However, remember that the adjective category of "attractive" also was used to describe students ranked high on the scale, so that there is some face validity to the scale. This is but one example of the general rule

that few if any of these attributes are factorially pure and unrelated to the others.

Low concern children were described by the coders as bossy, a term implying unrequested peer control. This is surprising, since this usually is considered a negative trait indicative of poor social functioning, and therefore possibly a cause for concern. However, it might be that children described as bossy were those that were achieving well enough to risk telling other children how to do things, and, as high achievers, would not cause teacher concern.

The last surprising finding was that children ranked high on looks you in the eyes were described by the coders with unclassifiable negative adjectives. Again, because this category of adjectives is so vague, the finding is difficult to interpret.

Some of these unexpected findings probably are caused by "halo effects." By looking at those adjectives which were given for children at high or low extremes on several scales, one can conclude which attributes were considered in completing the rankings besides the attributes defined by the scale.

There were 10 adjective variables scored for teachers which were significantly related to seven or more of the 13 scales. These were: responsibility, cooperation, activity, self-motivation, intelligence, achievement, work habits, inattentive, statements about the home, and percent positive statements. Four of these categories also were significantly related to seven or more scales for the coders: active, intelligence, work habits, and percent positive statements. In addition, the coders' descriptions of behavior were related to rankings on seven scales.

There probably were more such adjectives for the teachers than the coders because the teachers also created the rankings. Also, the teachers were probably more subject to halo effects because they spent more time with the children and had better-formed overall impressions. The coders generally did not get to know each child well enough to form strong feelings. The four adjectives which were related to several scales in the coder data represent student characteristics which probably were most apparent to objective observers within a short time.

The significant association of overall positive impressions (as measured by the percent of positive adjectives out of all adjectives given) with each scale, for both teachers and coders is further indication of a generalized attitude affecting the measurement of child attributes. This may explain why there are associations of achievement and/or intelligence with attractiveness, happiness, salience, and looks you in the eye.

The adjectives which were significantly associated with several scales were those related to academic performance and classroom behavior. The most pervasive characteristic was intelligence, being related significantly to every scale for both teachers and coders. That is, children at the positive end of each of the 13 scales were more likely to be described by both coders and teachers as intelligent than as not intelligent.

Therefor, it can be concluded that the most salient characteristics of students, and the best predictors of teacher rankings, are those related to intelligence, achievement, and general demeanor in the classroom. Children

viewed by their teachers as intelligent, achieving, and conforming are likely to be viewed favorably on almost any dimension, including those having no logical relationship to these attributes.

Reference Notes

1. Brophy, J., King. C., Evertson, C., Baum, M., Crawford, J., Mahaffey, L., & Sherman, G. Manual for the student attributes coding system (Res. Rep. 74-2). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1974.

2. Anderson, L., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Crawford, J., & Baum, M. The student attribute study: Relationships between classroom observation measures with teacher attitudes of attachment, rejection, and concern (Res. Rep. 75-13). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

3. Baum, M., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Crawford, J. & Anderson, L. Sex and grade differences in the interactions and classroom behaviors of children in grades two through five (Res. Rep. 75-18). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

4. Coulter, C., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Crawford, J., Baum, M., & Anderson, L. Sex and grade level differences in ratings of students by teachers and classroom observers (Res. Rep. 75-20). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

5. Baum, M., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Anderson, L., & Crawford, J. Grade and sex differences in adjective descriptions of elementary school children given by their teachers and by classroom observers (Res. Rep. 75-22). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

6. Evertson, C., Brophy, J., Anderson, L., Crawford, J., & Baum, M. Relationships of grade, sex, and teacher rankings to coder ratings on a checklist of student behaviors (Res. Rep. 75-25). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

References

Brophy, J. & Good, T. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Getzels, J. & Jackson, P. Creativity and intelligence: Explorations with gifted students. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. Behavioral expression of teacher attitudes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 63, 617-624.

Silberman, M. Behavioral expression of teachers' attitudes toward elementary school students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 402-407.

Footnotes

The authors wish to thank the following people, all of whom played key roles in one or more aspects of the Student Attribute Study: Connie Anderson, Cynthia Coulter, Bucky Evertson, Carol Greenhalgh, Janet Honea, Carol King, Jane Ogden, Georgia Reed, Dr. Kathleen Senior, Gael Sherman, Mike Tebeleff, Ann Turney, and Cicely Wynne, who collected data as classroom coders; Jim Blackwell, John Brozovsky, Paul Cockreham, Mary Jane Leahy, and Wally Washington, who assisted in data preparation or analysis; and Gwen Newman and Sidney Weaver, who assisted in manuscript preparation.

Table 1

Relationships between Teacher Rankings

and Adjective Descriptions[1]

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p[2]	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
The following bipolar variables were scored for both teachers and coders. Numbers in parentheses indicate scores for extremes.																				
1. Social Interactions: Interactive (2) vs. shy (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.80	1.39	1.31		1.33	1.43	1.31		1.00	1.41	1.50		1.29	1.59	1.41		1.17	1.46	1.40	
	5	23	16		6	21	13		7	17	6		14	22	17		6	24	15	
B. Coders	1.80	1.48	1.35	**	1.67	1.47	1.50		1.36	1.50	1.57		1.45	1.35	1.55		1.65	1.51	1.43	
	15	52	37		18	53	34		11	50	21		29	51	40		23	49	35	
2. Maturity: Mature (2) vs. immature (1)																				
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				1.14	1.44	1.94	**	Insufficient Data				1.25	1.30	1.94	**	1.00	1.40	2.00	**
					7	9	16						8	10	18		9	5	17	
B. Coders	1.00	1.36	2.00	**	1.20	1.20	1.63		Insufficient Data				1.17	1.50	1.75		1.17	1.27	2.00	**
	5	14	5		5	10	8						6	10	8		6	11	9	

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
3. Affect: Positive (2) vs. Negative (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.78 9	1.80 15	1.17 6	**	1.50 8	1.70 10	1.43 7		Insufficient Data				1.50 12	1.75 16	1.58 12		1.50 8	1.80 20	1.43 7	
B. Coders	1.80 10	1.48 23	1.60 15		1.78 9	1.50 18	1.65 17		1.40 5	1.52 23	1.80 15		1.70 10	1.56 27	1.70 20		1.75 12	1.58 24	1.65 17	
4. Quiet (2) vs. Talkative (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.22 9	1.74 31	1.95 22	**	1.40 10	1.72 32	1.81 21	*	Insufficient Data				1.80 15	1.84 32	1.78 23		1.53 15	1.73 30	1.95 20	**
B. Coders	1.57 14	1.84 44	2.00 38	**	1.72 18	1.84 51	1.82 38		1.88 16	1.89 46	1.68 19		1.86 28	1.84 58	1.77 35		1.75 24	1.80 50	1.94 35	
5. Cooperative (2) vs. Uncooperative (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.36 11	1.89 19	2.00 19	**	1.54 13	1.67 24	2.00 16	**	1.22 9	1.87 23	2.00 12	**	1.69 16	1.83 30	1.94 18		1.54 13	1.88 25	2.00 18	**
B. Coders	1.33 9	1.70 23	1.86 7	*	1.42 12	1.68 22	1.86 7		1.38 8	1.63 19	1.80 5		1.58 12	1.63 19	1.70 10		1.50 12	1.61 18	1.82 11	
6. Well-behaved (3) vs. Mild-Behavior Problem (2) vs. Severe Behavior Problem (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.74 19	2.33 9	3.00 5	**	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.81 16	2.08 12	2.00 7		Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	1.61 23	1.69 32	3.00 5	**	1.64 22	1.67 24	2.33 12	*	Insufficient Data				1.71 28	1.74 27	2.09 11		1.69 26	1.81 31	2.50 10	**

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
7. Confident (2) vs. Lacks Confidence (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.33 6	1.07 15	1.57 7		1.17 6	1.18 17	1.44 9		Insufficient Data				1.20 10	1.27 15	1.60 10		Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	1.60 5	1.50 22	1.33 9		1.57 7	1.33 12	1.75 8		Insufficient Data				1.42 7	1.53 19	1.60 10		1.43 7	1.44 16	1.56 9	
8. Self-motivated (2) vs. Requires External Motivation (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.24 17	1.62 26	1.84 19	**	1.33 18	1.64 22	2.00 22	**	1.40 10	1.64 22	2.00 12	**	1.39 23	1.63 30	1.87 23	**	1.19 16	1.65 26	2.00 22	**
B. Coders	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.40 10	1.50 16	1.91 11	*	1.40 5	1.71 14	1.71 7	
9. Intelligence: High (2) vs. Low (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.44 18	1.54 24	1.96 23	**	1.21 19	1.60 20	2.00 32	**	1.40 10	1.67 21	2.00 16	**	1.00 24	1.73 15	2.00 44	**	1.15 20	1.83 18	2.00 24	**
B. Coders	1.46 13	1.47 36	1.86 22	*	1.33 15	1.59 29	1.95 20	**	1.56 9	1.52 27	2.00 15	**	1.17 23	1.78 32	1.93 27	**	1.27 22	1.74 31	1.85 20	**
10. Achievement: High (3) vs. Average (2) vs. Low (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.64 11	1.82 33	2.67 24	**	1.11 9	1.83 30	2.86 21	**	Insufficient Data				1.00 17	2.24 33	2.93 27	**	1.39 18	2.19 27	2.81 27	**
B. Coders	1.44 9	2.44 16	2.55 22	**	1.57 7	2.35 17	2.72 25	**	Insufficient Data				1.80 10	2.33 21	2.65 26	**	1.67 9	2.50 18	2.70 23	**

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
11. Work Habits: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.29	1.69	1.86	**	1.35	1.61	1.94	**	1.41	1.68	1.79	*	1.60	1.59	1.81		1.33	1.70	1.86	**
	21	49	28		23	44	33		17	41	19		25	51	31		21	54	28	
B. Coders	1.61	1.71	1.95	**	1.46	1.71	1.95	**	1.38	1.71	1.86	**	1.64	1.78	1.93	**	1.65	1.78	1.91	*
	23	49	43		24	56	43		13	56	28		33	59	55		26	59	45	
12. Peer Relations: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.25	1.80	1.83	**	1.50	1.70	1.70		Insufficient Data				1.71	1.72	1.67		1.50	1.75	1.83	
	8	10	12		8	10	20						7	18	18		8	20	12	
B. Coders	1.42	1.82	1.78	**	1.69	1.77	1.85		1.38	1.82	1.88	**	1.59	1.74	1.81		1.60	1.76	1.80	
	12	28	23		13	30	27		8	28	16		17	34	27		15	41	20	
The following unipolar adjective variables were scored for both coders and teachers. When the adjective was given, a score of "1" was assigned. When it was not given, a "0" was assigned as the student's score.																				
N's for #13 through #23	N's = 56	112	69		38	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	
13. Aggressive																				
A. Teachers	.14	.04	.00	**	.07	.05	.01		.11	.04	.08		.01	.06	.05		.06	.06	.03	
B. Coders	.13	.08	.01	*	.14	.05	.03	*	.05	.09	.08		.11	.06	.07		.10	.07	.07	

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
N's =	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	
14. Responsible																				
A. Teachers	.00	.04	.12	**	.00	.04	.13	**	.00	.03	.12	*	.00	.06	.13	**	.00	.06	.14	**
B. Coders	.02	.04	.03		.02	.02	.03		.05	.02	.06		.01	.06	.05		.00	.05	.04	
15. Active																				
A. Teachers	.30	.06	.00	**	.19	.07	.03	**	.14	.08	.10		.13	.10	.06		.16	.10	.01	**
B. Coders	.39	.22	.06	**	.40	.21	.16	**	.32	.26	.22		.24	.27	.22		.34	.27	.15	*
16. Considerate																				
A. Teachers	.02	.12	.12		.06	.09	.09	*	.08	.09	.12		.06	.10	.10		.03	.10	.11	
B. Coders	.02	.02	.04		.02	.03	.04		.03	.02	.02		.01	.04	.01		.00	.05	.03	
17. Inattentive																				
A. Teachers	.09	.06	.01		.10	.08	.00	*	.08	.06	.06		.10	.05	.01	*	.10	.06	.03	
B. Coders	.14	.12	.10		.17	.11	.06		.19	.09	.12		.18	.08	.09		.15	.06	.10	
18. Low Frustration Tolerance																				
A. Teachers	.18	.09	.03	**	.14	.08	.06		.16	.05	.04	*	.11	.10	.02		.13	.05	.03	*
B. Coders	.11	.05	.00	*	.09	.05	.00	*	.08	.02	.06		.06	.05	.02		.08	.03	.01	

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
N's =	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	
19. Non-salient, Average																				
A. Teachers	.04	.04	.06		.00	.06	.04		.00	.05	.06		.01	.07	.02		.02	.05	.07	
B. Coders	.09	.13	.19		.09	.19	.19		.16	.22	.10		.13	.17	.15		.15	.16	.14	
20. Athletic																				
A. Teachers	.02	.06	.03		.03	.04	.08		.03	.05	.06		.00	.05	.09	*	.00	.06	.07	
B. Coders	.07	.04	.01		.09	.03	.04		.05	.05	.02		.04	.06	.02		.03	.04	.06	
21. Sense of Humor																				
A. Teachers	.04	.04	.04		.03	.02	.04		.05	.04	.02		.03	.02	.05		.03	.02	.03	
B. Coders	.04	.05	.01		.03	.04	.01		.05	.04	.02		.01	.03	.03		.03	.03	.00	
22. Residual Negative																				
A. Teachers	.04	.09	.03		.07	.10	.01		.05	.08	.02		.07	.06	.05		.06	.08	.03	
B. Coders	.14	.13	.06		.09	.10	.18		.05	.15	.12		.03	.15	.17	**	.05	.18	.07	*
23. Residual Positive																				
A. Teachers	.18	.18	.23		.21	.20	.22		.22	.20	.20		.15	.20	.23		.13	.19	.24	
B. Coders	.04	.07	.16	*	.02	.09	.13	*	.05	.07	.08		.04	.07	.16	*	.06	.06	.18	*

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless Low	Medium	High	p	Careful vs. Careless Low	Medium	High	p	Happy vs. Unhappy Low	Medium	High	p	Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever Low	Medium	High	p	Mature vs. Immature Low	Medium	High	p
The following adjective variables were scored as bipolar for coders but as unipolar for teachers. Scoring is noted.																				
24. Social Leadership																				
A. Teachers ("1" if social leadership mentioned; "0" otherwise).	.07 56	.04 112	.14 69		.07 58	.05 110	.18 77		.05 37	.06 101	.27 * 51		.03 72	.11 124	.16 88		.03 62	.08 123	.17 72	
B. Coders ("2" for social leader, "1" for social follower).	1.40 5	1.72 18	1.67 9		1.60 5	1.43 14	1.57 14		1.20 5	1.75 12	1.44 9		1.40 5	1.52 21	1.80 10		Insufficient Data			
25. Likability																				
A. Teachers ("1" if likable mentioned; "0" otherwise)	.25 56	.25 112	.26 69		.31 58	.20 110	.36 77		.11 37	.36 101	.35 51		.31 72	.35 124	.27 88		.26 62	.29 123	.31 72	
B. Coders ("2" for likable, "1" for obnoxious).	1.82 11	1.69 16	2.00 12		1.78 9	1.70 20	1.93 14		1.67 6	1.72 18	2.00 12		1.82 11	1.75 16	2.00 17		1.90 10	1.67 18	2.00 14	
26. Attractiveness																				
A. Teachers ("1" if attractive mentioned; "0" otherwise).	.36 56	.14 112	.17 69		.21 58	.27 110	.29 77		.16 37	.22 101	.20 51		.14 72	.29 124	.25 88		.26 62	.24 123	.28 72	
B. Coders ("2" for attractive, "1" for unattractive.	1.67 9	1.72 18	1.55 11		1.60 10	1.50 12	1.77 13		1.40 5	1.60 15	1.88 8		1.53 15	1.69 16	1.85 13		1.50 12	1.75 16	1.80 10	

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
27. Self-reliance																				
A. Teachers ("1" if teacher dependence mentioned; "0" otherwise).	.13	.07	.00	**	.14	.06	.04		.03	.06	.04		.08	.05	.03		.10	.10	.00	*
	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	
B. Coders ("2" for self-reliant, "1" for dependent).	1.30	1.48	1.25		1.40	1.33	1.32		1.40	1.43	1.23		1.43	1.38	1.39		1.17	1.35	1.46	
	10	23	16		10	21	22		5	14	13		14	24	23		6	31	13	
The following variables were scored only for teachers.																				
Bipolar Adjectives, Teachers Only																				
28. Statements about the Home: Positive vs. Negative (1)	1.10	1.29	1.44		1.08	1.21	1.43	*	1.10	1.20	1.64	**	1.12	1.20	1.52	**	1.04	1.25	1.59	**
	20	28	16		24	33	21		21	15	14		34	35	23		25	36	17	
Unipolar Adjectives, Teachers Only ("1" if mentioned, "0" otherwise).																				
N's for #29 through #36 N's =	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	
29. Creative	.07	.07	.12		.03	.10	.11		.03	.08	.16		.03	.06	.16	**	.02	.09	.13	*
30. Medical Problems	.09	.11	.03		.10	.15	.04		.05	.10	.00		.13	.08	.03		.13	.07	.01	*
31. Excessive Absence	.04	.06	.03		.07	.05	.01		.14	.03	.00	**	.10	.04	.00	**	.06	.06	.01	
32. Sweet	.00	.04	.12	**	.02	.05	.06		.05	.09	.06		.07	.04	.07		.03	.07	.04	

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
N's =	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	
33. Underachiever	.07	.03	.00	*	.13	.04	.03	*	.08	.05	.00		.07	.05	.02		.06	.03	.00	
34. Passive Reaction to Frustration	.02	.05	.03		.03	.05	.01		.03	.02	.02		.06	.04	.00		.03	.03	.00	
35. Proactive Immoral Behavior	.07	.03	.00	*	.09	.04	.00	*	.08	.04	.02		.08	.02	.01	*	.06	.02	.03	
36. Broken Home	.13	.09	.06		.09	.11	.05		.08	.04	.04		.13	.07	.07		.11	.06	.06	
The following variables were scored only for coders.																				
Bipolar Adjectives, Coders Only																				
37. Teacher Relations: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)	1.09	1.17	1.70	**	1.00	1.30	1.80	**	1.00	1.14	1.71	**	1.00	1.36	1.50	*	1.07	1.40	1.57	
	11	6	10		11	10	5		6	7	7		9	11	10		14	5	7	
Unipolar Adjectives, Coders Only ("1" if mentioned, "0" otherwise.)																				
38. Female Stereotype	.00	.05	.01		.02	.05	.06		.00	.02	.02		.06	.02	.02		.03	.05	.03	
	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	
39. Bossy	.05	.07	.06		.03	.08	.08		.03	.05	.14		.03	.07	.08		.05	.08	.04	
	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	

Adjective Description Variable	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Happy vs. Unhappy				Highest Achiever vs. Lowest Achiever				Mature vs. Immature			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
This variable was computed for both teachers and coders.																				
40. Percent Positive Adjectives (Positive Adjectives/Positive + Negative Adjectives)																				
A. Teachers	34.41	59.01	82.41	**	31.97	58.66	81.31	**	36.24	66.63	81.69	**	40.50	62.90	80.38	**	33.08	63.07	82.94	**
	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	
B. Coders	42.73	51.13	68.77	**	41.93	51.45	66.57	**	39.24	53.66	63.90	**	43.31	53.08	66.47	**	43.73	53.84	70.85	**
	56	112	69		58	110	77		37	101	51		72	124	88		62	123	72	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative				Creative vs. Not Creative				Attractive vs. Unattractive				Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily				Attachment vs. Rejection			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
The following bipolar variables were scored for both teachers and coders. Numbers in parentheses indicate scores for extremes.																				
1. Social Interaction: Interactive (2) vs. shy (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.20	1.50	1.20		1.11	1.44	1.43		1.13	1.35	1.25		1.14	1.57	1.36		Insufficient Data			
	5	26	10		9	18	7		8	17	8		7	23	14					
B. Coders	1.56	1.57	1.44		1.32	1.45	1.60		1.30	1.51	1.55		1.50	1.55	1.44		1.54	1.45	1.41	
	16	51	34		19	44	20		23	47	20		18	51	36		13	38	32	
2. Maturity: Mature (2) vs. Immature (1)																				
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.17	1.44	1.95 **		Insufficient Data			
													6	9	19					
B. Coders	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
3. Affect: Positive (2) vs. Negative (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.33	1.83	1.63		1.80	1.83	1.67		1.33	1.80	2.00 *		1.56	1.74	1.57		1.50	1.77	1.60	
	6	18	8		5	12	6		9	10	5		9	19	7		6	13	5	
B. Coders	1.70	1.46	1.69		1.50	1.75	1.64		1.43	1.69	1.60		1.75	1.48	1.65		1.56	1.42	1.62	
	10	24	16		6	20	14		7	16	10		8	27	17		9	19	13	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative Low	Medium	High	p	Creative vs. Not Creative Low	Medium	High	p	Attractive vs. Unattractive Low	Medium	High	p	Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily Low	Medium	High	p	Attachment vs. Rejection Low	Medium	High	p
4. Quiet (2) vs. Talkative (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.20	1.66	1.94	**	1.89	1.81	1.69		1.80	1.70	1.75		1.44	1.69	1.79		1.50	1.82	1.89	*
	5	35	18		9	32	13		10	30	8		9	32	19		6	22	19	
B. Coders	1.64	1.81	1.94	*	1.94	1.86	1.80		1.91	1.82	1.82		1.79	1.78	1.80		1.82	1.83	1.90	
	14	54	32		18	43	20		22	44	17		19	49	35		11	35	31	
5. Cooperative (2) vs. Uncooperative (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.44	1.80	2.00	**	2.00	1.95	1.75		1.67	1.74	1.89		1.36	1.88	2.00	**	1.40	1.88	2.00	**
	9	20	17		6	22	8		9	27	9		11	25	15		5	16	12	
B. Coders	1.25	1.89	1.83	**	1.75	1.68	1.57		1.71	1.67	1.50		1.36	1.68	1.80		1.00	1.69	1.71	**
	12	19	6		8	16	7		7	18	8		11	19	10		6	16	7	
6. Well-behaved (3) vs. Mild-behavior Problem (2) vs. Severe Behavior Problem (1)																				
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				2.33	2.00	2.40		Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.50	2.13	2.60	*
					6	10	5										10	8	5	
B. Coders	1.52	1.70	2.50	**	1.53	1.79	1.88		1.67	1.68	1.43		1.50	1.76	2.45	**	1.47	1.86	2.40	**
	23	27	10		15	19	8		12	28	7		20	21	11		19	21	10	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative Low	Medium	High	p	Creative vs. Not Creative Low	Medium	High	p	Attractive vs. Unattractive Low	Medium	High	p	Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily Low	Medium	High	p	Attachment vs. Rejection Low	Medium	High	p
7. Confident (2) vs. Lacks Confidence (1)																				
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.09	1.17	1.43		1.25	1.27	1.43		Insufficient Data			
									11	6	7		8	11	7					
B. Coders	Insufficent Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
8. Self-motivated (2) vs. Requires External Motivation (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.08	1.65	1.95 **		1.44	1.69	1.73		1.44	1.52	1.78		1.16	1.56	2.00 **		1.23	1.76	1.87 **	
	13	26	20		9	26	15		16	23	18		19	25	24		13	25	15	
B. Coders	1.60	1.60	1.75		Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.14	1.69	1.86 **		1.20	1.43	1.71	
	5	15	8										7	16	7		5	14	7	
9. Intelligence: High (2) vs. Low (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.50	1.42	1.96 **		1.00	1.85	1.95 **		1.29	1.68	2.00 **		1.18	1.75	2.00 **		1.33	1.63	2.00 **	
	14	19	24		16	13	20		17	28	8		17	20	31		18	16	25	
B. Coders	1.44	1.55	1.95 **		1.00	1.75	1.80 **		1.15	1.75	2.00 **		1.27	1.64	1.90 **		1.15	1.57	1.95 **	
	16	33	19		14	28	15		13	28	19		15	28	20		13	28	19	
10. Achievement: High (3) vs. Average (2) vs. Low (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.80	2.00	2.68 **		1.33	2.24	2.80 **		1.30	2.10	2.30 **		1.09	1.88	2.84 **		1.14	2.16	2.61 **	
	10	38	22		15	25	15		10	29	20		11	26	31		7	25	28	
B. Coders	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.20	2.25	2.80 **		Insufficient Data			
													5	12	25					

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative Low	Medium	High	p	Creative vs. Not Creative Low	Medium	High	p	Attractive vs. Unattractive Low	Medium	High	p	Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily Low	Medium	High	p	Attachment vs. Rejection Low	Medium	High	p
11. Work Habits: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.24	1.65	1.89	**	1.59	1.63	1.80		1.50	1.64	1.72		1.26	1.65	1.92	**	1.18	1.57	1.88	**
	21	49	28		17	43	20		14	45	18		19	40	36		11	35	33	
B. Coders	1.40	1.72	1.91	**	1.73	1.80	1.85		1.52	1.78	1.89	**	1.46	1.79	1.95	**	1.38	1.78	1.95	**
	20	58	35		15	54	33		21	54	27		26	56	44		16	46	37	
12. Peer Relations: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)																				
A. Teachers	1.14	1.65	1.92	**	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.57	1.60	1.76		Insufficient Data			
	7	17	12										7	20	17					
B. Coders	1.64	1.72	1.95		1.60	1.73	2.00		1.54	1.78	1.70		1.58	1.88	1.90	*	1.71	1.69	1.86	
	11	32	20		5	30	16		13	32	20		12	25	21		7	29	22	
The following unipolar adjectives variables were scored for both coders and teachers. When the adjective was given, a score of "1" was assigned. When it was not given, a "0" was assigned as the student's score.																				
N's for #13 through #23 N's =	48	119	65		38	101	54		47	104	52		54	112	78		39	95	67	
13. Aggressive																				
A. Teachers	.17	.05	.00	**	.03	.07	.04		.11	.01	.06	*	.06	.01	.01		.08	.01	.03	
B. Coders	.08	.07	.02		.05	.12	.02		.02	.11	.06		.11	.04	.05		.08	.08	.07	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative				Creative vs. Not Creative				Attractive vs. Unattractive				Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily				Attachment vs. Rejection			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
N's =	48	119	65		38	101	54		47	104	52		54	112	78		39	95	67	
14. Responsible																				
A. Teachers	.00	.01	.15	**	.00	.10	.07		.00	.09	.04		.00	.03	.17	**	.00	.04	.13	**
B. Coders	.04	.06	.05		.00	.05	.02		.02	.04	.06		.02	.06	.01		.00	.08	.00	*
15. Active																				
A. Teachers	.21	.09	.00	**	.08	.10	.02		.13	.13	.08		.19	.13	.03	**	.28	.07	.03	**
B. Coders	.46	.24	.11	**	.18	.27	.20		.26	.25	.25		.35	.31	.19		.44	.23	.19	**
16. Considerate																				
A. Teachers	.02	.08	.12		.03	.12	.13		.06	.13	.12		.04	.11	.09		.05	.09	.13	
B. Coders	.00	.04	.03		.00	.05	.02		.00	.03	.08		.02	.02	.04		.00	.07	.03	
17. Inattentive																				
A. Teachers	.10	.07	.00	*	.11	.04	.04		.13	.06	.02	*	.11	.04	.00	**	.15	.06	.00	**
B. Coders	.17	.13	.11		.18	.11	.06		.21	.07	.08	*	.17	.09	.08		.23	.12	.10	
18. Low Frustration Tolerance																				
A. Teachers	.15	.09	.02	*	.08	.06	.09		.11	.08	.06		.13	.09	.04		.10	.06	.04	
B. Coders	.08	.03	.00		.03	.01	.06		.06	.02	.06		.09	.04	.00	*	.08	.02	.03	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative				Creative vs. Not Creative				Attractive vs. Unattractive				Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily				Attachment vs. Rejection			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
N's =	48	119	65		38	101	54		47	104	52		54	112	79		39	95	67	
19. Non-salient, Average																				
A. Teachers	.00	.07	.05		.00	.07	.02		.04	.08	.00		.00	.06	.03		.00	.04	.03	
B. Coders	.10	.17	.12		.24	.14	.09		.23	.14	.10		.06	.19	.18	*	.08	.14	.16	
20. Athletic																				
A. Teachers	.02	.03	.05		.00	.05	.11	*	.00	.03	.10	*	.00	.06	.08		.00	.06	.07	
B. Coders	.06	.02	.02		.03	.07	.06		.02	.04	.06		.04	.05	.04		.05	.06	.03	
21. Sense of Humor																				
A. Teachers	.04	.03	.03		.00	.02	.04		.02	.04	.04		.04	.04	.05		.00	.02	.04	
B. Coders	.00	.06	.02		.03	.04	.04		.02	.02	.06		.02	.04	.03		.00	.05	.03	
22. Residual Negative																				
A. Teachers	.08	.10	.00	*	.13	.02	.09	*	.15	.02	.06	**	.06	.11	.01		.05	.08	.01	
B. Coders	.15	.16	.06		.00	.13	.15	*	.11	.12	.23		.04	.16	.21	*	.10	.09	.12	
23. Residual Positive																				
A. Teachers	.15	.18	.23		.16	.21	.24		.18	.16	.17		.20	.13	.23		.08	.14	.22	
B. Coders	.06	.07	.18	*	.08	.08	.11		.04	.12	.08		.04	.11	.14		.05	.07	.15	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative Low	Medium	High	p	Creative vs. Not Creative Low	Medium	High	p	Attractive vs. Unattractive Low	Medium	High	p	Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily Low	Medium	High	p	Attachment vs. Rejection Low	Medium	High	p
The following adjective variables were scored as bipolar for coders but as unipolar for teachers. Scoring is noted.																				
24. Social Leadership																				
A. Teachers ("1" if social leadership mentioned; "0" otherwise.)	.00 48	.12 119	.15 65		.05 38	.04 101	.22 * 54		.00 47	.06 104	.15 52		.04 54	.07 112	.18 78		.05 39	.06 95	.21 67	
B. Coders ("2" for social leader, "1" for social follower)	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
25. Likability																				
A. Teachers ("1" if likable mentioned; "0" otherwise.)	.17 48	.39 119	.40 65		.32 38	.30 101	.26 54		.13 47	.25 104	.38 52		.19 54	.27 112	.38 78		.21 39	.25 95	.39 67	
B. Coders ("2" for likable "1" for obnoxious)	1.75 8	1.74 23	2.00 10		1.86 7	1.77 13	1.81 16		1.56 9	1.81 16	2.00 6		1.67 9	1.64 14	1.92 12		1.71 7	1.73 11	2.00 10	
26. Attractiveness																				
A. Teachers ("1" if attractive mentioned; "0" otherwise.)	.17 48	.25 119	.22 65		.16 38	.30 101	.19 54		00 47	.33 104	.35 ** 52		.19 54	.27 112	.21 78		.10 39	.15 95	.27 67	
B. Coders ("2" for attractive, "1" for unattractive.)	1.43 7	1.60 15	1.56 9		1.40 5	1.81 16	1.83 6		1.20 10	1.69 13	1.91 ** 11		1.45 11	1.80 15	1.85 13		1.60 5	1.60 15	1.86 7	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative Low	Medium	High	p	Creative vs. Not Creative Low	Medium	High	p	Attractive vs. Unattractive Low	Medium	High	p	Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily Low	Medium	High	p	Attachment vs. Rejection Low	Medium	High	p
27. Self-reliance																				
A. Teachers ("1" if dependence mentioned; "0" otherwise.)	.06	.10	.02		.03	.06	.07		.02	.08	.08		.07	.08	.05		.08	.06	.00	
	48	119	65		38	101	54		47	104	52		54	112	78		39	95	67	
B. Coders ("2" for self-reliant, "1" for dependent.)	1.33	1.48	1.23		1.43	1.38	1.22		1.13	1.44	1.36		1.29	1.41	1.37		1.38	1.53	1.38	
	6	25	13		7	24	9		8	25	11		7	29	19		8	17	13	
The following variables were scored only for teachers																				
Bipolar Adjectives:																				
28. Statements about the home: Positive (2) vs. negative (1)	1.05	1.26	1.73	**	1.23	1.20	1.38		1.08	1.30	1.29		1.08	1.19	1.56	**	1.12	1.10	1.63	**
	21	31	15		13	25	16		24	27	14		25	31	25		17	29	19	
Unipolar Adjectives ("1" if mentioned, "0" otherwise.):																				
N's for #29 through #36 N's =	48	119	65		38	101	54		47	104	52		54	112	78		39	95	67	
29. Creative	.04	.08	.09		.03	.03	.22	**	.06	.07	.13		.06	.08	.10		.03	.07	.09	
30. Medical Problems	.13	.08	.02	*	.16	.08	.06		.17	.09	.02	*	.11	.08	.03		.13	.11	.03	
31. Excessive Absence	.06	.06	.02		.05	.05	.00		.11	.03	.02	*	.11	.05	.01	*	.08	.09	.01	
32. Sweet	.00	.02	.11	**	.03	.06	.04		.04	.02	.02		.04	.04	.08		.00	.08	.06	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative				Creative vs. Not Creative				Attractive vs. Unattractive				Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily				Attachment vs. Rejection			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
N's =	48	119	65		38	101	54		47	104	52		54	112	78		39	95	67	
33. Underachiever	.10	.03	.00	**	.03	.01	.06		.09	.05	.02		.09	.04	.03		.10	.04	.00	*
34. Passive Reaction to Frustration	.02	.06	.00		.05	.03	.04		.06	.00	.04		.04	.05	.01		.03	.05	.00	
35. Proactive Immoral Behavior	.08	.04	.00		.03	.02	.04		.09	.01	.04		.06	.04	.00		.10	.03	.00	**
36. Broken Home	.06	.07	.03		.11	.07	.09		.13	.09	.06		.11	.09	.05		.08	.15	.04	
The following variables were scored only for coders.																				
Bipolar Adjectives:																				
37. Teacher Relations: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)	1.11 9	1.33 6	1.50 8		Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				1.00 12	1.50 6	1.71 7	**	1.13 8	1.17 6	1.63 8	
Unipolar Adjectives: ("1" if mentioned; "0" otherwise.):																				
38. Female Stereotype	.03 48	.04 119	.05 65		.05 38	.01 101	.00 54		.02 47	.04 104	.00 52		.02 54	.05 112	.05 78		.05 39	.03 95	.01 67	
39. Bossy	.03 48	.07 119	.08 65		.03 38	.06 101	.06 54		.06 47	.05 104	.08 52		.04 54	.09 112	.08 78		.05 39	.09 95	.07 67	

Adjective Description Variable	Cooperative vs. Uncooperative Low	Medium	High	p	Creative vs. Not Creative Low	Medium	High	p	Attractive vs. Unattractive Low	Medium	High	p	Tries Hard vs. Gives Up Easily Low	Medium	High	p	Attachment vs. Rejection Low	Medium	High	p
This variable was computed for both teachers and coders.																				
40. Percent Positive Adjectives (Positive Adjectives/ Positive + Negative Adjectives)																				
A. Teachers	29.48	56.92	85.94	**	42.95	69.13	73.07	**	37.68	62.92	71.60	**	32.91	59.63	83.49	**	28.18	59.89	84.85	**
	48	119	65		38	101	54		47	104	52		54	112	78		39	95	67	
B. Coders	40.48	51.69	70.45	**	41.08	56.16	64.61	**	36.66	55.19	59.67	**	37.56	52.87	65.50	**	33.00	52.04	65.67	**
	48	119	65		38	101	54		47	104	52		54	112	78		39	95	67	

Adjective Description Variable	Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
The following bipolar variables were scored for both teachers and coders. Numbers in parentheses indicate scores for extremes.												
1. Social Interaction: Interactive (2) vs. shy (1)												
A. Teachers	1.50	1.47	1.14		1.18	1.44	1.75	*	Insufficient Data			
	8	19	7		11	18	8					
B. Coders	1.52	1.55	1.29		1.15	1.62	1.83	**	1.27	1.48	1.69	*
	29	42	17		26	45	18		15	44	13	
2. Maturity: Mature (2) vs. Immature (1)												
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
3. Affect: Positive (2) vs. Negative (1)												
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				1.40	1.61	2.00	*	Insufficient Data			
					5	18	7					
B. Coders	1.59	1.63	1.57		1.20	1.62	1.77	*	1.50	1.56	1.89	
	17	19	7		5	21	13		6	16	9	

Adjective Description Variable	Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
4. Quiet (2) vs. Talkative (1)												
A. Teacher	1.65 17	1.74 27	1.64 11		2.00 15	1.67 18	1.33 12	**	Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	1.79 28	1.79 43	1.88 16		2.00 26	1.89 35	1.46 13	**	1.85 13	1.83 40	1.78 9	
5. Cooperative (2) vs. Uncooperative (1)												
A. Teachers	2.00 12	1.74 23	1.60 5		2.00 10	1.86 21	1.73 11		Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	1.71 7	1.69 16	1.29 7		Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
6. Well-behaved (3) vs. Mild-behavior problem (2) vs. Severe Behavior Problem (1)												
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	2.17 6	1.61 23	1.69 16		2.29 7	1.57 14	1.25 8	*	1.60 10	1.93 15	2.00 5	

Adjective Description Variable	Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
7. Confident (2) vs. Lacks Confidence (1)												
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				1.29 7	1.45 11	1.67 6		Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	1.80 5	1.60 15	1.50 6		1.00 6	1.56 9	1.75 8	**	Insufficient Data			
8. Self-motivated (2) vs. Requires External Motivation (1)												
A. Teachers	1.86 14	1.65 26	1.36 14	**	1.47 17	1.56 16	1.79 19		1.50 8	1.71 14	2.00 8	
B. Coders	2.00 7	1.62 13	1.38 8	*	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
9. Intelligence: High (2) vs. Low (1)												
A. Teachers	1.92 24	1.55 11	1.00 9	**	1.27 11	1.60 15	1.95 22	**	1.11 9	1.41 17	2.00 8	**
B. Coders	2.00 15	1.57 28	1.29 17	**	1.43 14	1.57 23	1.96 24	**	1.00 7	1.52 23	2.00 10	**
10. Achievement: High (3) vs. Average (2) vs. Low (1)												
A. Teachers	2.88 24	1.91 23	1.08 12	**	1.85 13	1.80 25	2.80 15	**	Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	2.74 23	2.25 16	1.60 5	**	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			

Adjective Description Variable	Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You In the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
11. Work Habits: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)												
A. Teachers	1.96	1.61	1.39	**	1.62	1.51	1.90		1.55	1.43	1.81	
	24	44	18		13	35	20		11	30	16	
B. Coders	1.91	1.77	1.60	*	1.74	1.78	1.81		1.54	1.84	1.92	*
	34	48	20		19	49	21		13	45	13	
12. Peer Relations: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)												
A. Teachers	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
B. Coders	1.91	1.74	1.58		1.50	1.88	1.63		Insufficient Data			
	22	27	12		10	25	16					
The following unipolar adjective variables were scored for both coders and teachers. When the adjective was given, a score of "1" was assigned. When it was not given, a "0" was assigned as the student's score.												
N's for #13 through #23 N's =	63	99	45		40	93	57		29	90	35	
13. Aggressive												
A. Teachers	.03	.06	.04		.00	.06	.14	*	.03	.03	.06	
B. Coders	.02	.09	.07		.05	.09	.07		.07	.07	.03	

Adjective Description Variable		Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
		Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
	N's =	63	99	45		40	93	57		29	90	35	
14. Responsible													
A. Teachers		.10	.05	.00		.05	.04	.09		.03	.04	.11	
B. Coders		.03	.06	.07		.05	.06	.04		.00	.04	.00	
15. Active													
A. Teachers		.03	.11	.22	**	.03	.05	.21	**	.21	.07	.06	*
B. Coders		.14	.31	.31	*	.03	.25	.32	**	.38	.30	.29	
16. Considerate													
A. Teachers		.14	.09	.04		.10	.06	.07		.10	.08	.06	
B. Coders		.02	.01	.00		.10	.03	.00	*	.00	.07	.00	
17. Inattentive													
A. Teachers		.02	.07	.13	*	.05	.08	.02		.14	.06	.00	*
B. Coders		.14	.07	.11		.13	.10	.07		.14	.17	.06	
18. Low Frustration Tolerance													
A. Teachers		.05	.05	.16	*	.03	.10	.11		.03	.07	.11	
B. Coders		.00	.03	.07		.10	.03	.07		.03	.00	.06	

Adjective Description Variable		Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You In the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
		Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
	N's =	63	99	45		40	93	57		29	90	35	
19. Non-salient, Average													
A. Teachers		.05	.09	.00		.03	.04	.02		.00	.02	.06	
B. Coders		.17	.16	.16		.23	.16	.04	*	.14	.17	.09	
20. Athletic													
A. Teachers		.05	.05	.00		.00	.06	.07		.00	.03	.09	
B. Coders		.06	.04	.04		.00	.04	.05		.10	.03	.03	
21. Sense of Humor													
A. Teachers		.02	.03	.02		.00	.01	.07	*	.03	.01	.03	
B. Coders		.02	.04	.00		.03	.04	.05		.03	.01	.00	
22. Residual Negative													
A. Teachers		.02	.06	.02		.03	.12	.05		.07	.06	.03	
B. Coders		.14	.15	.09		.08	.14	.26	*	.03	.12	.40	**
23. Residual Positive													
A. Teachers		.22	.17	.24		.08	.22	.26	*	.17	.21	.17	
B. Coders		.10	.08	.00		.05	.11	.04		.03	.06	.11	

Adjective Description Variable	Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
The following adjective variables were scored as bipolar for coders but as unipolar for teachers. Scoring is noted.												
24. Social Leadership												
A. Teachers ("1" if social leadership mentioned; "0" otherwise.)	.19 63	.04 99	.04 45		.00 40	.09 93	.21 57	*	.07 29	.04 90	.40 35	**
B. Coders ("2" for social leader, "1" for social follower.)	1.67 9	1.50 12	1.60 5		Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
25. Likability												
A. Teachers ("1" if likable mentioned; "0" otherwise.)	.25 63	.30 99	.27 45		.20 40	.37 93	.39 57		.00 29	.29 90	.29 35	
B. Coders ("2" for likable, "1" for obnoxious.)	1.93 14	1.71 14	1.83 6		1.86 7	1.69 16	1.77 13		Insufficient Data			
26. Attractiveness												
A. Teachers ("1" if attractive mentioned; "0" otherwise.)	.19 63	.22 99	.22 45		.20 40	.19 93	.32 57		.07 29	.16 90	.34 35	
B. Coders ("2" for attractive "1" for unattractive.)	1.89 9	1.69 16	1.33 6	*	Insufficient Data				1.86 7	1.62 13	1.78 9	

Adjective Description Variable	Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
27. Self-reliance												
A. Teachers ("1" if dependence mentioned; "0" otherwise.)	.05	.04	.13		.00	.10	.05		.17	.10	.06	
	63	99	45		40	93	57		29	90	35	
B. Coders ("2" for self-reliant "1" for dependent.)	1.43	1.38	1.60		1.43	1.21	1.29		Insufficient Data			
	14	21	5		7	14	14					
The following variables were scored only for teachers.												
Bipolar Adjectives:												
28. Statements about the Home: Positive (2) vs. Negative (1)	1.58	1.26	1.11	**	1.31	1.18	1.29		1.00	1.07	1.50	**
	12	27	18		13	28	17		16	28	6	
Unipolar Adjectives: ("1" if mentioned, "0" otherwise.)												
N's for #29 through #26 N's =	63	99	45		40	93	57		29	90	35	
29. Creative	.11	.07	.04		.03	.05	.16	*	.03	.06	.17	*
30. Medical Problems	.00	.07	.13	**	.15	.08	.05		.00	.09	.03	
31. Excessive Absence	.02	.04	.09		.10	.02	.00	**	.17	.04	.00	**
32. Sweet	.08	.06	.04		.10	.03	.02		.03	.07	.03	
33. Underachiever	.02	.05	.11		.03	.06	.04		.10	.04	.00	
34. Passive Reaction to Frustration	.00	.03	.04		.03	.08	.00		.03	.06	.00	

Adjective Description Variable	Concern vs. Low Concern				Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable				Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes			
	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p	Low	Medium	High	p
N's =	63	99	45		40	93	57		29	90	35	
35. Proactive Immoral Behavior	.00	.05	.04		.05	.03	.05		.10	.01	.03	*
36. Broken Home	.06	.04	.07		.08	.10	.07		.17	.13	.06	
The following variables were scored only for coders.												
Bipolar Adjectives:												
37. Teacher Relations: Good (2) vs. Poor (1)	Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data				Insufficient Data			
Unipolar Adjectives: ("1" if mentioned, "0" otherwise.):												
38. Female Stereotype	.02	.06	.02		.05	.05	.02		.00	.04	.06	
	63	99	45		40	93	57		29	90	35	
39. Bossy	.11	.08	.00	*	.00	.09	.14	*	.03	.08	.11	
	63	99	45		40	93	57		29	90	35	

Adjective Description Variable	Concern vs. Low Concern Low	Medium	High	p	Stands Out, Very Noticeable vs. Not Noticeable Low	Medium	High	p	Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes Low	Medium	High	p
This variable was computed for both teachers and coders.												
40. Percent Positive Adjectives (Positive Adjectives/ Positive + Negative Adjectives)												
A. Teachers	83.10 63	59.86 99	39.40 45	**	61.10 40	54.95 93	71.42 57	*	38.17 29	62.96 90	76.49 35	**
B. Coders	66.75 63	52.27 99	39.07 45	**	48.18 40	55.23 93	58.35 57	*	36.52 29	53.93 90	57.20 35	**

[1] Groups N's are listed below each group mean for bipolar adjectives, and at the top of each column for unipolar adjectives, since the N is the same for each variable in this category for a given scale.

[2] * $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Appendix I

Frequency Distributions of Descriptive Adjectives

Used by Classroom Observers and by Teachers in

Free-Response Sketches of the Target Children

EXPLANATION OF TABLE NUMBERS

1. The first number opposite the variable name is the number of children actually scored for that variable.
2. The second number is the percent of the total number of adjectives given which were scored on that variable (to the nearest whole %).
3. The number opposite each adjective under each variable name is the frequency with which that specific adjective or description was given (or at least an almost identical one in form and meaning).

NOTE: The sum of the frequencies for each adjective subsumed under the variable name does not invariably equal the number of children actually scored for that variable. This occurred because a specific adjective was counted each time it was used, but if 2 or more adjectives/descriptions were given for a given child which fell under the same variable name, the child was scored only once for that variable. Example: If a child was described as "likeable" and "has a good personality," he would only receive one score for the variable LIKEABLE, yet each adjective would also be listed under variable composition. Hence frequently the two values will not be equal.

CLASSROOM OBSERVERS' ADJECTIVE DESCRIPTIONS

VARIABLE COMPOSITION

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Socially interactive		75	9
vs.			
	Friendly	27	
	Outgoing	11	
	Social/sociable	11	
	Gregarious	8	
	Playful	5	
	Outspoken	4	
	Enjoys working with others	2	
	Socially interactive	2	
	Interactive (aggressively) w/ peers	2	
	Moderately interactive w/ peers	1	
	Extroverted	1	
	Disrupts through social chat & play	1	
	Engages in much social play	1	
	Too many social interests to be academic	1	
	Socially interactive & playful	1	
	Socially mature and active	1	
	Assertive	1	
	Socially oriented	1	
	Attends to peers	1	
Shy		80	
	Shy	27	
	Reserved	15	
	Non-interactive	7	
	Introverted	7	
	Passive with peers	6	
	Keeps to self	4	
	Timid	4	
	Private	3	
	Has few peer interactions	3	
	Passive	3	
	Withdrawn	3	
	Works alone	3	
	Aloof	3	
	Bashful	2	
	Socially non-interactive	2	
	Not social, but has friend	2	
	Remains in background socially	2	
	Introspective	2	
	Won't socialize	1	
	Unassertive	1	
	Doesn't mix much w/ peers	1	
	Stuck-up	1	
	Prefers solitude	1	
	Outsider from cliques	1	
	Restrained	1	
	Reticent	1	
	Reads instead of interacting	1	
	Keeps to self	1	
	Retiring	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Social Leader		28	3
vs.			
	Leader	12	
	Social-peer leader	8	
	Class leader	3	
	Peer leader (nonacademic)	2	
	Looked up to	2	
	Unself-conscious leader	1	
	Student council representative	1	
Social Follower		21	
	Passive	11	
	Social follower	4	
	Follower	3	
	Submissive	2	
	Unassertive	1	
	Easily led	1	
	Not initiator but responds	1	
	Easily manipulated	1	
Likeable		47	3
vs.			
	Likeable	31	
	Nice	6	
	Loveable	4	
	Very appealing	3	
	Pleasant	2	
	Delightful	1	
	Good disposition	1	
	Congenial	1	
Obnoxious		13	
	Annoying	4	
	Obnoxious	2	
	Phony	1	
	Bothersome	1	
	Irritating	1	
	Grating	1	
	Unpleasant	1	
	Nuisance to others	1	
	Ugly Disposition	1	
Aggressive		27	2
	Aggressive	16	
	Bully	2	
	Occasionally mean to peers	2	
	Aggressive if provoked	2	
	Mean	2	
	Much physical play & aggression	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Aggressive, con't.			
	Aggressive w/ peers	1	
	Aggressively interactive w/ peers	1	
	Mean & cruel	1	
Responsible		17	1
	Responsible	6	
	Reliable	5	
	Dependable	4	
	Academically responsible	1	
	Takes responsibility	1	
Mature		16	2
vs.			
	Mature	18	
	Mature in actions	1	
Immature	Immature	17	
	Big baby	1	
	Naive	1	
Positive Affect		46	4
vs.			
	Happy	30	
	Cheerful	12	
	Fun loving	5	
	Jovial	3	
	Good humor	2	
	Easy to laugh	1	
	Engagingly happy	1	
	Vivacious	1	
	Glowing	1	
	Smiley	1	
Negative Affect		27	
	Serious	11	
	Unhappy	3	
	Worried-looking	2	
	Frowner	1	
	Doesn't smile	1	
	Non-emotive	1	
	No affect	1	
	Easily upset	1	
	Somber	1	
	Sad	1	
	Grumpy	1	
	Solemn	1	
	Guilt-ridden	1	
	Prone to grumpiness	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Negative Affect, con't.			
	Sober	1	
	Discouraged	1	
	Never smiles	1	
	Not overtly happy	1	
	Lack of emotional expression	1	
	Emotionally controlled	1	
Quiet		129	9
vs.			
	Quiet	149	
	Soft-spoken	2	
	Silent	1	
Talkative		28	
	Talkative	13	
	Loud	8	
	Boisterous	5	
	Talker	2	
	Chatty	2	
	Talks a moderate amount	1	
	Shrill	1	
Cooperative		38	3
vs.			
	Cooperative	16	
	Helpful	11	
	Compliant	5	
	Eager to please	4	
	Wants to help teacher	2	
	Enjoys helping	1	
	Responsive to peer and teacher wishes	1	
Uncooperative		22	
	Defiant	9	
	Defies	2	
	Uncooperative	2	
	Sullen	2	
	Sassy	2	
	Sullen if provoked	2	
	Hostile	1	
	Argumentative	1	
	Ignores teacher directives	1	
	Smart-ass attitude	1	
	Antagonistic	1	
	Likes his own way	1	
	Smart aleck	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Well Behaved		21	5
vs.			
	Well behaved	9	
	Good behavior	7	
	No discipline problems	3	
	Doesn't get into trouble	1	
	Acceptable behavior	1	
	Adequate behavior	1	
	Model behavior	1	
Mild Behavior Problem		23	
vs.			
	Mischievous	8	
	Show-off	4	
	Occasionally disruptive	3	
	Sometimes troublemaker	2	
	A little disruptive at times	2	
	Minor discipline problem	1	
	Needs to be controlled	1	
	Behavior to + & - extremes	1	
	Behavior problem due to social chat	1	
	Gets into trouble	1	
	Undisciplined at times	1	
	On the fringe of trouble , but doesn't start it	1	
Severe Behavior Problem		42	
	Troublemaker	13	
	Disruptive	9	
	Requires much management	5	
	Frequently disruptive	3	
	Unwitting troublemaker	2	
	Undisciplined	2	
	Bothers others	2	
	Gets a lot of behavioral contacts	1	
	Always gets into trouble	1	
	Attracts trouble	1	
	Hell on wheels	1	
	Behavior problem	1	
	Usually in trouble	1	
	Discipline problem	1	
	Causes trouble	1	
	Frequently disciplined	1	
	Capable of causing trouble	1	
	Troublesome	1	
Active		90	5
	Active	44	
	Restless	22	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Active, con't.			
	Hyperactive	9	
	Energetic	7	
	Bouncy	3	
	Rowdy	2	
	Out of seat	2	
	Wandering	2	
	Drifts	1	
	Kinetic	1	
	Constantly in motion	1	
	Underfoot a lot	1	
	Fidgety	1	
	Frisky	1	
	Excess energy	1	
	Won't settle down	1	
	Lively	1	
	Excitable	1	
	Bubbling	1	
Attractive		38	3
vs.			
	Cute	15	
	Attractive	9	
	Pretty	8	
	Handsome	3	
	Good-looking	2	
	Well-dressed	2	
	Elegant	1	
	Golden-haired honey	1	
Unattractive		20	
	Unattractive	6	
	Slovenly	2	
	Unkempt	2	
	Poorly groomed	2	
	Anemic Looking	2	
	Bad personal appearance	1	
	Plain	1	
	Ragamuffin	1	
	Frowzy looking	1	
	Dumpy	1	
	Ugly	1	
Confident		23	3
vs.			
	Confident	9	
	Self-confident	2	
	Relaxed	2	
	Content	2	
	Calm	2	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Confident, con't.			
	Feels superior	1	
	Over-confident	1	
	Sure of self	1	
	Self assured	1	
	Socially confident	1	
	Un-self-conscious	1	
	Poised	1	
	Composed	1	
Lacks Confidence		24	
	Lacks confidence	5	
	Insecure	5	
	Anxious	5	
	Unsure	4	
	Hesitant	1	
	Feels inferior	1	
	Unsure w/ peers	1	
	Unsure of work	1	
	Nervous	1	
Self-Motivated		24	2
vs.			
	Interested	10	
	Inquisitive	3	
	Enthusiastic	2	
	Independent worker	2	
	Curious	2	
	Go-getter	1	
	Enjoys school	1	
	Resourceful	1	
	Eager	1	
	Involved	1	
	Works without prodding	1	
Requires External Motivation		19	
	Apathetic	2	
	Bored	2	
	Needs prodding to do work	2	
	Works when prodded	1	
	Works only when prodded	1	
	Can't do work without management	1	
	Teacher has to stay on her to get work	1	
	Not interested in work	1	
	Unmotivatable	1	
	Not stimulated by school work	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Requires External Motivation, con't.			
	Not motivated	1	
	Dislikes school	1	
	Disinterested in school	1	
	Lazy	1	
	Uninterested in school	1	
Considerate		11	1
	Polite	4	
	Considerate	3	
	Kind	1	
	Likes to help	1	
	Motherly	1	
	Do-gooder	1	
	Generous	1	
	Well-mannered	1	
High Intelligence		67	6
vs.			
	Bright	35	
	Smart	20	
	Intelligent	13	
	Sharp	3	
	Quick	2	
	Brilliant	1	
	Fast thinking	1	
Low Intelligence		34	
	Slow	11	
	Not too bright/sharp/smart	7	
	Slow learner	6	
	Dumb	6	
	Dull-witted	2	
	Limited ability	2	
	Appears slow witted	1	
	Has hard time w/ work	1	
High Achievement		38	4
vs.			
	Good student	28	
	Academic leader	2	
	A grade ahead in reading	2	
	Obsessive achiever	1	
	Achiever	1	
	Good schoolwork	1	
	Model student	1	
	Academically successful	1	
	Meaningful contributor to class	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
High Achievement, con't.			
	Versatile achiever	1	
	Strong academically	1	
	Model schoolwork	1	
	Does well	1	
	Best student	1	
	Good to average student	1	
Average Achievement		19	
	vs.		
	Average student	6	
	Capable student	4	
	Competent	3	
	Average worker	2	
	Not a high achiever	2	
	Average in academic	1	
	Average (achievement wise)	1	
	Average achiever	1	
	Adequate performance	1	
	Not highly successful	1	
Low Achievement		10	
	vs.		
	Low to mediocre student	4	
	Poor student	2	
	Requires special instruction	1	
	Low achiever	1	
	Academic non-performer	1	
	Slow in academic areas	1	
	Low achievement	1	
Good Work Habits		141	10
	vs.		
	Studious	42	
	Conscientious	21	
	Good worker	20	
	Steady worker	16	
	Does work	11	
	Hard working	10	
	Tries hard	8	
	Tries to work	8	
	Neat	4	
	Industrious	3	
	Works good	3	
	Diligent	3	
	Busy	2	
	Average worker	2	
	Seems to try	2	
	Efficient	2	
	Diligent worker	2	
	Persistent worker	2	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Good Work Habits, con't.			
	Good studier	1	
	Good work habits	1	
	Pretty good worker	1	
	Works a lot	1	
	Worker	1	
	Hard worker	1	
	Seeks help when needed	1	
	Eager to respond	1	
	Enthusiastic worker	1	
	Tries	1	
	Conscientiously does duties	1	
	Works at school work	1	
	Perfectionist	1	
	Compulsive	1	
	Tries too hard	1	
	Applies self	1	
	Work is well done	1	
	Works constantly	1	
Poor Work Habits		42	
	Non-task oriented	7	
	Non-studious	6	
	Never works	5	
	Dodges work	2	
	Poor worker	2	
	Doesn't participate	2	
	Little participation	2	
	Slow worker	2	
	More interested in peer interaction than work	2	
	Doesn't finish work	2	
	Can't stick with work	2	
	Won't do much work	1	
	Lazy work habits	1	
	Doesn't work a whole lot	1	
	Won't work	1	
	Works only part of the time	1	
	Doesn't work much	1	
	Social talk to detriment of schoolwork	1	
	Nonproductive	1	
	Uninvolved in class activities	1	
	Passive resistance in doing schoolwork	1	
	Lackadaisical in work	1	
	Messy	1	
	Not industrious	1	
	Wastes time	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Inattentive		37	2
	Easily distracted	8	
	Distractable	6	
	Inattentive	4	
	Flighty	3	
	Daydreamer	3	
	Day dreamy	2	
	Dreamer	2	
	Dawdler	2	
	Daydreams	1	
	In a fog	1	
	Confused	1	
	Foggy head	1	
	Vacant	1	
	Had difficulty concentrating	1	
	Problem distracts from schoolwork	1	
	Often distracted by peers	1	
	Spends lots of time daydreaming	1	
	Spends lots of time in fantasy-play	1	
	Short attention span	1	
Low Frustration Tolerance		16	1
	Sulks	3	
	Frustrated	2	
	Cranky	2	
	Easily angered	2	
	Bad temper	1	
	Easily frustrated	1	
	Feelings hurt by Teacher correction	1	
	Whiney	1	
	Pouty	1	
	Defensive	1	
	On the verge of tears	1	
	Finds excuses for behavior or not doing the work	1	
	Cry baby	1	
	Temperamental	1	
	Has a chip on his shoulder	1	
Non-salient, Average		50	3
	Unobtrusive	28	
	Not noticeable	5	
	Average	4	
	Relatively unnoticeable	3	
	Not salient	3	
	Overlooked	3	
	Inconspicuous	2	
	Unassuming	2	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Non-salient, Average, con't.			
	Nothing out of the ordinary	1	
	Very nondescript	1	
	Obscure	1	
	Typical	1	
	Low-profile	1	
	Dull	1	
	Doesn't stand out	1	
	Easily overlooked	1	
Self-reliant vs.		28	4
	Independent	18	
	Self-reliant	9	
	Makes few demands on teacher	1	
	Doesn't require much teacher help	1	
	Avoids teacher contact	1	
	Independent thinker	1	
Teacher Dependent		50	
	Approval-seeker	15	
	Attention seeker	9	
	Teacher dependent	8	
	Brown noser	7	
	Dependent	4	
	Needs (physical) affection	3	
	Demanding	2	
	Eager to impress adults	2	
	Follows teacher	1	
	Frequently asks for help	1	
	Pestery	1	
	Teacher dependent tattletale	1	
	Wants to be teacher's pet	1	
	Constantly seeks teacher interaction	1	
	Works for attention	1	
	Frequently gets reassurance from teacher	1	
Female Stereotype		13	1
	Prissy	4	
	Delicate	2	
	Prim	2	
	Fussy (prim & proper)	1	
	Demure	1	
	Ladylike	1	
	Feminine	1	
	Boy crazy	1	
	Flirt	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Athletic		15	1
	Athletic	12	
	Tomboy	2	
	Tomboyish	2	
Sense of Humor		11	1
	Funny	3	
	Silly	3	
	Good humor	2	
	Clownish	2	
	Good sense of humor	2	
Residual Negative		51	3
	Spoiled	8	
	Busybody	8	
	Tattle-tale	7	
	Clumsy	4	
	Catty	4	
	Self-centered	3	
	Obtrusive	2	
	Ruthlessly selfish	2	
	Awkward	2	
	Bitchy	2	
	Guilty-looking	1	
	Particular	1	
	Sicky-sweet	1	
	Sissy looking at times	1	
	Erratic	1	
	Condescending	1	
	Glassy-eyed	1	
	Looks like a "loose woman"	1	
	All-American boy (negative)	1	
	Snotty little twirp	1	
	Finicky	1	
	Full of herself (negative)	1	
	Opportunist	1	
	Sluggish	1	
	Effeminate (male)	1	
	Frivolous	1	
	Sly	1	
	Inconsiderate of others	1	
	Unresponsive	1	
	Shifty-eyed	1	
Residual Positive		29	2
	Capable	3	
	Alert in class	3	
	Well adjusted	2	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Residual Positive, con't.			
	Easy going	2	
	Gentle	2	
	Average intelligence	2	
	Sweet	2	
	Peer tutor	1	
	Adventurous	1	
	Well-rounded	1	
	Extremely verbal	1	
	Iconoclast	1	
	Dignified	1	
	Genuine	1	
	Good kid	1	
	All-American boy	1	
	Cherub-like	1	
	Alert	1	
	Bright-eyed	1	
	Upright	1	
Good Peer Relations		76	6
vs.			
	Popular	34	
	Well-liked	23	
	Respected	6	
	Gets along w/ peers	3	
	Successful, skilled in peer interactions	2	
	Good peer interactions	3	
	Enjoys friends	2	
	Gets along well	1	
	Has good many friends	1	
	2-3 close friends	1	
	Plays with peers a lot	1	
	Very social	1	
	Has select group of friends	1	
	Good social skills	1	
	Mixes well	1	
	Well-liked in his gang	1	
	Accepted in peer group	1	
	Close friendships w/ peers	1	
	Close ties w/ few friends	1	
	Interacts well w/ peers	1	
	Average in peer interactions	1	
	Socially mature	1	
Poor Peer Relations		25	
	Has few (close) friends	7	
	Poor social skills	3	
	Unpopular	2	
	Not well-liked	2	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Poor Peer Relations, con't.			
	Low status w/ peers	1	
	Poor peer relations	1	
	Sasses peers	1	
	Didn't speak or play w/ peers	1	
	Stuck-up	1	
	Immature in social interactions	1	
	Manipulates friends	1	
	Awkward socially	1	
	Has difficulty maintaining friendships	1	
	Responds inappropriately in peer interactions	1	
	Not well thought of	1	
	Aggravates peers	1	
	Not accepted	1	
	Socially immature	1	
	Snobby	1	
	Inappropriate social behavior	1	
Bossy		22	1
	Bossy (Bossing)	15	
	Pushy	3	
	Takes role of teacher (to tell others what to do)	2	
	Runs everything	1	
	Demanding	1	
	Likes to be in charge	1	
	Dominant, strong	1	
	Overbearing	1	
Good Teacher Relations		10	2
vs.			
	Well liked by teacher	4	
	Teacher's pet	3	
	Chosen for many class jobs	1	
	Called on to help teacher	1	
	Bragged on by teacher	1	
	Teacher favoritism	1	
	Uncanny ability to interact positively w/ teacher	1	
Poor Teacher Relations		24	
	Picked on	5	
	Doesn't get much teacher attention	4	
	Avoids teacher contact	3	
	Not many teacher contacts	3	
	Harassed by teacher	2	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Poor Teacher Relations, con't.			
	Sometimes falsely accused	1	
	Gets criticized a lot	1	
	Not liked by teacher	1	
	Teacher didn't communicate w/ her much	1	
	Doesn't interact w/ teacher	1	
	Pain of teacher	1	
	Not well received (by teacher)	1	
	Has to have last work in exchanges w/ teacher	1	

THUMBNAIL SKETCHES--CODERS--UNCODABLE ADJECTIVES

Apparently the principal formed a contract with him to eliminate his poor behavior

Had a broken jaw w/ mouth wired shut for a week

Beams when praised

From poor family

High absentee rate--bad bike wreck

Toughy

Absent a lot

Speech different

Always caused trouble when there was a substitute

Non-aggressive (f=2)

Teasing (f=2)

Appears dumb, but isn't really

Tiny (f=3)

Mature in appearance

Chuncky (f=2)

Hippie

Squinty-eyed

Poor financially

Very country red-neck

Likes to read aloud

Low-key person

Future class queen

Country bumpkin

Very noticeable because of big size and volume

Different

Gawky

Impish

Tries to please, but doesn't

Reads a lot

Prim (male)

Knows how to play the game

Likes to giggle

Animal lover

Sensitive (f=4)

Enigmatic

Future Cheerleader type

Red-neck queen

Mature body

Sensitivity hidden behind outward show of strength

Contemplative

Tries to get favors, arrange things her way

All boy

Sickly, misses school

Unaggressive (f=2)

Thoughtful (meaning"Ponders" not "considerate") (f=2)

He's a 50-50:1/2 time good and works, 1/2 time he's hell (f=2)

TEACHER'S ADJECTIVE DESCRIPTIONS

VARIABLE COMPOSITION

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Socially Interactive		27	4
vs.			
	Friendly	10	
	Sociable	7	
	Outgoing	5	
	Warm	2	
	Outspoken	2	
	Easy to talk to	1	
	Extrovert	1	
	Gregarious	1	
	Likes to interact	1	
Shy		43	
	Shy	20	
	Withdrawn	7	
	Reserved	7	
	Loner	4	
	Timid	3	
	No mingling w/ others	2	
	Needs time alone	1	
	Passive, watches, doesn't play	1	
	Freezes in public response opportunities	1	
	Unfriendly	1	
Social Leader		18	1
	Leader	17	
	Outspoken--a leader	1	
Likeable		55	3
	Likeable	15	
	Good personality	9	
	Pleasant	7	
	Nice	6	
	Good natured	2	
	Good hearted	2	
	Loveable	2	
	I love him	1	
	A dear	1	
	Nice person	1	
	I like him	1	
	Mr. personality	1	
	Good kid	1	
	Enjoyable	1	
	Want to cuddle him	1	
	Adorable	1	
	Very precious child	1	
	Fun	1	
	Brings out positive response in people	1	
	Charmer	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Aggressive		20	1
	Aggressive	11	
	Bully	4	
	Starts fights	2	
	Rough play	2	
	Mean	1	
	Sadistic	1	
	Pusher, shover	1	
	Picks on others	1	
Responsible		19	1
	Responsible	9	
	Dependable	9	
	Trustworthy	1	
	Reliable	1	
Mature		25	2
vs.			
	Mature	23	
	Very mature	2	
Immature		15	
	Immature	14	
	Babyish	1	
Positive Affect		31	3
vs.			
	Happy	21	
	Cheerful	3	
	Affectionate	3	
	Sunny	1	
	Vivacious	1	
	Happy-go-lucky	1	
	Jovial	1	
	Lighthearted	1	
	Big smile	1	
	Likes a good time	1	
Negative Affect		17	
	Unhappy	6	
	Moody	4	
	Too serious	3	
	Stolid	1	
	Apathetic	1	
	Downcast	1	
	Disgruntled	1	
	Not at rest inside	1	
	Doesn't smile much	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Quiet		69	6
vs.			
	Quiet	66	
	Speaks softly	3	
Talkative		25	
	Talker	16	
	Loud	5	
	Boisterous	5	
	Loudmouth	1	
Cooperative		59	5
vs.			
	Cooperative	25	
	Helpful to Teacher	25	
	Eager to please	10	
Uncooperative		16	
	Behaviorally uncooperative	3	
	Defiant	3	
	Doesn't follow directions	3	
	Insolent	1	
	Obstinant	1	
	Sullen	1	
	Talks back	1	
	Stubborn	1	
	Negative approach to so many things	1	
	Not anxious to please anyone but himself	1	
	Aggression if asked to do something he doesn't want to	1	
Well Behaved		14	3
vs.			
	Well behaved	4	
	Sits & does what he is supposed to	2	
	Obedient	1	
	Good behavior	1	
	No discipline problems	1	
	Even tempered	1	
	Mild tempered	1	
	Self disciplined	1	
	Stays out of trouble	1	
	Respects adult authority	1	
	Pliable	1	
Mild Behavior Problem		20	
vs.			
	Mischievous	4	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Mild Behavior Problem, con't.			
	Rowdy	2	
	Apologizes, then does it again	1	
	Teases girls	1	
	Show-off	1	
	Requires management	1	
	Can't keep hands to self	1	
	Gets into trouble	1	
	Needs to settle down	1	
	Misbehaves & wanders around	1	
	Poor behavior	1	
	Gets into devilment	1	
	Some trouble with impulse control	1	
	Behavior problems which are improving	1	
	Needs a firm hand	1	
	Improved ring-tailed tooter	1	
	Cuts up	1	
Severe Behavior Problem		15	
	Trouble-maker	4	
	Disruptive behavior	4	
	Disturbs class	4	
	Belligerent	1	
	Real discipline problem	1	
	Behavior Problem	1	
Active		38	2
	Hyperactive	12	
	Active	8	
	Usually out of place	6	
	Feisty	5	
	Fidgety	3	
	Energetic	2	
	Rambunctious	2	
	Restless	2	
	Frisky	1	
	Mind in an excited state	1	
	Live wire	1	
	Full of adrenalin	1	
	Can't sit still	1	
Attractive		41	3
	Attractive	13	
	Cute	10	
	Pretty	4	
	Strange looking, but attractive	3	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Attractive, con't.			
	Beautiful	3	
	Good looking	3	
	Well groomed	2	
	Picture of health	1	
	Handsome	3	
Confident		13	3
vs.			
	Confident	5	
	Feels good about himself	3	
	Poised	2	
	Smiles confidently	1	
	Too confident	1	
	Likes to get up in front of a group	1	
	Not anxious about anything	1	
Lacks Confidence		33	
	Lacks confidence	7	
	Insecure	6	
	Nervous in new situations	3	
	Anxious	3	
	Unsure of self	3	
	Nervous	2	
	Self-conscious	2	
	Nervous when Teacher is angry	1	
	Insecure re work	1	
	Poor self-concept	1	
	Low self-esteem	1	
	Uncertain	1	
	Unsure of abilities	1	
	Only speaks when certain correct	1	
	Will be absent to avoid making class presentation	1	
	Gets tension stomach aches	1	
	Inferiority complex	1	
	Mousey	1	
	Apologizes for her presence	1	
Self Motivated		55	5
vs.			
	Displays enthusiasm re schoolwork	7	
	Interested in school	6	
	Curious	6	
	Anxious to achieve	5	
	Wants to do well	4	
	Enthusiasm	3	
	Easily motivated	3	
	Wants to achieve	3	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Self Motivated, con't.			
	Competitive	3	
	Does more than required	3	
	Works for the fun of it	2	
	Ambitious	2	
	Eager	2	
	Enjoys school	2	
	Inquisitive	1	
	Exuberant re work	1	
	Thinks he ought to be tops	1	
	Resourceful	1	
	Takes pride in work	1	
	Drives self	1	
	Loves school	1	
	Wants to be challenged	1	
	Learns for the joy of it	1	
	Self motivating	1	
	Takes initiative	1	
Requires External Motivation		35	
	Needs (constant) prodding	9	
	Lazy	7	
	Bored, no motivation	2	
	Needs encouragement	2	
	Needs motivation	2	
	Responds to praise to do better	2	
	Not easily motivated	2	
	Won't work unless interested	1	
	Complacent	1	
	Works only when placed by teacher	1	
	Parent & teacher cooperate to get work in	1	
	Not interested in school	1	
	Apathetic re work	1	
	Works under threat	1	
	Hard to channel	1	
	Lackadaisical	1	
	Gives up easily	1	
	Doesn't want to do school work	1	
Considerate		31	2
	Kind	10	
	Polite	6	
	Courteous	5	
	Sensitive of others' feelings	4	
	Thoughtful	3	
	Motherly (takes care of things)	2	
	Good manners	2	
	Considerate	2	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Considerate, con't.			
	Helps peers	2	
	Loving	1	
	Generous	1	
	Patient	1	
	Compliments teacher and others	1	
High Intelligence		68	6
vs.			
	Intelligent	41	
	Smart	10	
	Bright	10	
	Brightest	2	
	High IQ	1	
	Sharp thinker	1	
	Good reasoning power	1	
	Doesn't have to put out to learn	1	
	Quick learner	1	
	Clever	1	
Low Intelligence		32	
	Slow learner	19	
	Has peaked	2	
	Slow	2	
	Dumb	2	
	Has difficulty learning	2	
	Slow in work	1	
	MBI	1	
	Not very capable	1	
	Low IQ	1	
	Learning disability	1	
	Not real smart	1	
	Not as intelligent as others	1	
High Achievement		51	6
vs.			
	Good student	30	
	High achiever	5	
	Reads at above grade level	3	
	Academic leader	2	
	Very good student	1	
	Does good work	1	
	Very good in math	1	
	Best student	1	
	Great scholastic improvements	1	
	Excellent student	1	
	Excellent in Science	1	
	Especially good reader	1	
	Ideal student	1	
	Aggressively academic	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
High Achievement, con't.			
	Perfect student	1	
	Good in class	1	
	Double promoted	1	
	Excells academically	1	
Average Achievement		19	
vs.			
	Average student	12	
	Average work	1	
	Average achiever	1	
	Average worker	1	
	Average grades	1	
	Fairly good student	1	
	Achieves	1	
	Capable	1	
Low Achievement		29	
	Below grade level	5	
	Retained this year	4	
	Behind in reading	3	
	Behind academically	3	
	Low achiever	2	
	Low in reading	2	
	Slow in Math	2	
	Low student	2	
	Slow achiever	1	
	Slow reader	1	
	Low academically	1	
	Not a good student	1	
	Not a high achiever	1	
	Poor in school	1	
Good Work Habits		94	9
vs.			
	Hard worker	31	
	Tries hard	18	
	Good worker	14	
	Does work	6	
	Studious	5	
	Conscientious	4	
	Active participant	3	
	Persistent	3	
	Perfectionist	3	
	Neat/careful worker	3	
	Well organized	2	
	Tries	2	
	Will ask for help if needed	1	
	Won't give up easily	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Good Work Habits, con't.			
	One of my best workers	1	
	Gets work done despite . . .	1	
	Industrious	1	
	Works with great care	1	
	Quick worker	1	
Poor Work Habits		53	
	Messy/sloppy work	10	
	Socializes instead of working	6	
	Slow in work	6	
	Disorganized	5	
	Doesn't finish work	5	
	Wastes time	4	
	Poor work habits	3	
	Poor worker	2	
	Careless re work	2	
	Slow to turn in work	2	
	Procrastinator	2	
	Wants you to think he's busier than he really is	2	
	Loses things	2	
	Lacks self-discipline	1	
	Haphazard in work	1	
	Doesn't participate actively	1	
	Does work as homework instead of school work	1	
	Focuses on only part of assignment	1	
	Just gets by on work	1	
	Doesn't always perform	1	
	Careless	1	
	No effort	1	
Inattentive		18	1
	Short attention span	4	
	In own world, resents intrusion	3	
	Daydreams	3	
	Easily distracted	2	
	Lack of concentration	2	
	Disoriented	1	
	Out to lunch	1	
	Doesn't listen well	1	
	Easily confused	1	
	Not attentive	1	
	Detached	1	
Low Frustration Tolerance		31	2
	Whiney	5	
	Explosive (temper wise)	5	
	Can't accept own mistakes	5	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Low Frustration Tolerance, con't.			
	Cries easily from frustration	5	
	Poor frustration tolerance	2	
	Pouts	2	
	Resents correction	2	
	Overreacts	1	
	Hurt feelings	1	
	Temper tantrums	1	
	Easily hurt feelings	1	
	Sensitive to criticism	1	
	Easily discouraged	1	
	Gets red & ruffed up when angry	1	
Creative		31	2
	Creative	17	
	Artistic	8	
	Imaginative	4	
	Talented	1	
	Mechanically inclined	1	
	Loves to work w/ hands & makes things	1	
Non-Salient, Average		15	1
	Non-salient	4	
	Generally average	2	
	Nothing to set him apart, not noticeable	2	
	Unobstrusive	2	
	Blah--not outstanding	1	
	Dubious	1	
	Ordinary	1	
	Typical	1	
	Not unusual	1	
Teacher Dependent		24	1
	Attention seeker	5	
	Wants attention	5	
	Overly eager to please teacher	2	
	Seeks teacher approval	2	
	Very dependent	2	
	Wants teacher help when could help self	1	
	Pesty to teacher	1	
	Too much with teacher	1	
	Thrives on attention	1	
	Likes physical affection	1	
	Needs constant attention	1	
	Needs attention, praise	1	
	Peer dependent	4	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Athletic		15	1
	Athletic	8	
	Tomboy	4	
	Sports-nut	2	
	Rough play, boyish, masculine	1	
	Typical male-big husky athletic	1	
Sense of Humor		13	1
	Good sense of humor	10	
	Funny	2	
	Clever and humourous at times	1	
	"We tease each other constantly and play fun-type tricks"	1	
Residual Negative		26	2
	Nosy	5	
	Dingaling	3	
	Scatterbrain	3	
	Spoiled	2	
	Unswayed by teacher anger	1	
	Mostly messed up, headed for a painful adolescence	1	
	Tactless	1	
	Conceited	1	
	Sarcastic	1	
	Feminine male	1	
	Meddlesome	1	
	Threatened principal	1	
	Doesn't show respect	1	
	Has deteriorated	1	
	Complainer	1	
	Lacks sense of humor	1	
Positive Statements about the Home vs.		28	7
	Good home	5	
	Nice family	5	
	Cooperative parents	4	
	Parents active in PTA	3	
	Good home environment	2	
	Mother is a teacher	2	
	Intelligent parents	2	
	Very bright mother	1	
	Parents provide much stimulation	1	
	Lovely parents	1	
	Family oriented home	1	
	Stable family	1	
	Father is a principal	1	
	Strict but loving parents	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Negative Statements about the Home		86	
	Divorce	16	
	"Home problems"	11	
	Step-father	8	
	Separated parents	6	
	Over critical parents	5	
	Sibling rivalry	5	
	Poor (financially)	4	
	Strict parents	3	
	No English spoken in the home	3	
	Father died	2	
	Ill parent	2	
	No father	2	
	Absent father	2	
	Uncooperative parents	2	
	Overindulged	2	
	Mother doesn't like him	2	
	Family full of slow kids	1	
	Father ran off	1	
	Brother big-mouthed, bossy, effeminate	1	
	Apathetic family	1	
	Ignorant parents	1	
	Chauvinistic father	1	
	Alcoholic father	1	
	Working parents	1	
	Parents take in foster children	1	
	Mother is an Ex-con	1	
	Father is a murderer	1	
Medical Problems		30	2
	Speech Problem	8	
	Psychiatric case	4	
	On medication	3	
	Hearing problems	3	
	Damaged teeth-gums	2	
	Rashes	2	
	Crosseyed	1	
	Wears strong glasses	1	
	Has a glass eye	1	
	Surgery last year	1	
	Diabetic	1	
	Has fingers missing	1	
	Asthma	1	
Excessive Absence		13	1
Teacher-Teacher Discrepancy (One school only)		5	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Residual Positive		72	4
	Improved recently	13	
	Well rounded, good kid	5	
	The kind you pray for	5	
	Knows the difference between right and wrong	4	
	Capable	3	
	Average ability	2	
	Normal intelligence	2	
	Attentive	2	
	Very honest	2	
	Perceptive	2	
	Neat	2	
	Aggressiveness has changed to verbal solutions	2	
	All boy	2	
	Honest to a fault	1	
	I expect her to do great things	1	
	Has common sense	1	
	Has a good heart	1	
	Wise	1	
	Fluent in Spanish and English	1	
	Verbally skilled	1	
	Has become more salient	1	
	Good handwriting	1	
	Modest	1	
	Has won school honors	1	
	Well informed	1	
	Takes things in stride	1	
	Likes to read	1	
	Helps peers	1	
	Sense of fairness	1	
	Integrity	1	
	Has ability	1	
	Knows how	1	
	Alert	1	
	Pleased about "girliness," but not extreme	1	
Good Peer Relations		39	3
	vs.		
	Gets along well with peers	14	
	Well liked	14	
	Popular	5	
	Good peer relations	3	
	Lots of friends	1	
	Intense friendships	1	
	Works well with other children	1	

VARIABLE NAME	ADJECTIVE USED	RAW FREQUENCY	%
Poor Peer Relations		18	
	Has poor peer relations	5	
	Isolated from peers	1	
	Has only one friend	1	
	Doesn't play with peers	1	
	Disliked by peers & teacher	1	
	A loner, but not by preference	1	
	Has problems getting along	1	
	Has difficulty with peers	1	
	Doesn't fit in	1	
	Kids pick on her a lot	1	
Sweet		21	1
Underachiever		16	1
	Underachiever	8	
	Tends to be more capable than work indicates	3	
	Has ability but is behind	2	
	Academic could be better with more effort	1	
	High IQ, but low performance	1	
	In high group but lazy--poor work	1	
Passive Reaction to Frustration		13	1
	Whiney	5	
	Cries easily from frustration	5	
	Pouts	2	
	Hurt feelings	2	
Proactive Immoral Behavior		13	1
	Liar	3	
	Cheater	2	
	Steals	2	
	Dishonest	2	
	Curses	2	
	Tells tall tales	1	
	Has habits & words beyond his age	1	
	Devious	1	
	Not original in his work	1	
	Fails to accept blame when known guilty	1	
Broken Home		31	2
	Divorce	16	
	Has Step-father	8	
	Separated	6	
	Father ran off	1	

THUMBNAIL SKETCHES--TEACHERS--UNCODABLE ADJECTIVES

Puzzling, often sensitive to others needs, sometimes not

Squeaky voice

Youngest member of Audubon Society--knows all about birds

Wants to be a Teacher

Black, but not bused--family in neighborhood. Dances well--rhythm!

Marshmellow--big & fat--but beautiful skin & eyes

Mother ill, but no effects noted

We're not reaching her

Cousin to ___--close

Tall

Two sisters, no brother, bright mother

Wrong reading group by mistake, cried and was changed

Works closely with step-father

Big family

Only child (f=3)

Good in math, slow in reading

Foreign parents

Little old man

Youngest of four

Black, bused (f=2)

Liberal parents

Lebanese, youngest child

Biggest pack-rat around

Athletic, but accident prone

Second biggest pack-rat

Cowboy (f=2)

Uses restroom every 30 minutes

Wants to grow up fast

Teacher and Mother concerned

Teacher concerned

Spanish nature--(quiet)

German background

Going through the change

Interested in Mother

Siblings were behavior problems

Redneck

Redneck family living next to hippie family, but get along

Snubs old friends

Untidy desk

Older than peers

Free spirit

Lives with grandparents

Only girl & baby of family

Music fan and kids make fun of this

Enjoys new step-dad

Sleeps in clothes occasionally, family getting help

Evil Knievel or Bat man

Has gone through many changes

"a case"; Mother considers her child "perfect"

Sister of_____

Like ___; good reader, but low on other things--in a dreamworld about school work

1 Year older than others, parent's didn't get birth certificate so she could go

Brother dependent

Concerned with keeping up w/ possessions

Eats paste

Retain in 1st grade

Referred for testing

Sweet like a deer (named Bambi)

Enthusiastic when something new she understands

Wide-eyed

Fools you--learns when you don't expect it

Conscious of her appearance

Is two different children depending whether on or off medication

Has older sister who does things with him

Family from Sweden

A lot going on inside

Parents are Pentacostal ministers and family tours and sings

Chess champion

Intense

Harder to read than younger brother

Intense, enjoys music

Stole money, but taken care of

_____'s brother (f=3)

On the patro; Mother remarried but kids have same last name

Anglicized Mexican American